THIS BOOK
MUST NOT BE REMOVED
FROM THE LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON LIBRARY

PARL. PAPERS
FOR REFERENCE ONLY.

616977

THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(AUTHORISED EDITION),

FOURTH SERIES.

FIFTH SESSION OF THE TWENTY-SEVENTH PARLIAMENT

OF THE

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

4 EDWARD VII.

VOLUME CXXXIV.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE TWENTY-NINTH DAY OF APRIL
TO THE SIXTEENTH DAY OF MAY, 1904.

SIXTH VOLUME OF SESSION

1904.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED,
UNDER CONTRACT WITH HIS MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE,
BY
WYMAN AND SONS, LIMITED, FETTER LANE, LONDON.

$472

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/parliamentary-debates_april-29-may-16-1904_134

CHRONOLOGY OF "THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES."

THE PARLIAMENTARY HISTORY contains all that can be collected of the Legislative History of this country from the Conquest to the close of the XVIIIth Century (1803), 36 vols. The chief sources whence these Debates are derived are the Constitutional History, 24 vols.; Sir Simonds D'Ewes' Journal; Debates of the Commons in 1620 and 1621; Chandler and Timberland's Debates, 22 vols.; Grey's Debates of the Commons, from 1667 to 1694, 10 vols.; Almon's Debates, 24 vols.; Debrett's Debates, 63 vols.; The Hardwicke Papers; Debates in Parliament by Dr. Johnson, &c., &c.

THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES commence with the year 1803, and the contents are set forth in the following Chronological Table:—

HISTORY.

CONQUEST to 34 GEO. II.—1066 to 1760.

Vol. 1 to 15, 1 Will. I. to 34 Geo. II.
1066-1760

REIGN OF GEORGE III.—1760 to 1820.

Vol. 15 to 35, 1 Geo. III. to 40 Geo. III.
1760-1800

(First Parliament.)

Vol. 35 ....41 Geo. III..........1801
— 36 ....42 — 1802

(Second Parliament.)

Vol. 36 ....42 Geo. III. 1802-3

DEBATES.

First Series.

(Second Parliament—*continued.*)

Vol. 1 & 2...44 Geo. III.......1803-4
— 3 to 5...45 — 1805
— 6 & 7...46 — 1806

(Third Parliament.)

Vol. 8 & 9...47 Geo. III.......1806-7

(Fourth Parliament.)

Vol. 9 to 11...48 Geo. III.......1807-8
— 12 — 14...49 — 1809
— 15 — 17...50 — 1810
— 18 — 20...51 — 1810-11
— 21 — 23...52 — 1812

(Fifth Parliament.)

Vol. 24 to 26...53 Geo. III. ... 1812-13
— 27 & 28...54 — ... 1813-14
— 29 to 31...55 — ... 1814-15
— 32 — 34...56 — 1816
— 35 & 36...57 — 1817
— 37 — 38...58 — 1818

(Sixth Parliament.)

Vol. 39 & 40...59 Geo. III. 1819
— 41 ....60 — ... 1819-20

Second Series.

REIGN OF GEORGE IV.—1820 to 1830.

(Seventh Parliament.)

Vol. 1 to 3... 1 Geo. IV. 1820
— 4 & 5... 2 — 1821
— 6 — 7... 3 — 1822
— 8 — 9... 4 — 1823
— 10 — 11... 5 — 1824
— 12 — 13... 6 — 1825-6
— 14 — 15... 7 — 1826

(Eighth Parliament.)

Vol. 16 .... 7 Geo. IV. 1826
— 17 .... 8 — 1827
— 18 & 19... 9 — 1828
— 20 — 21...10 — 1829
— 22 to 25...11 — 1830

Third Series.

REIGN OF WILLIAM IV.—1830 to 1837

(Ninth Parliament.)

Vol. 1 to 3... 1 Will. IV.......1830-1

(Tenth Parliament.)

Vol. 4 to 8... 2 Will. IV. 1831
— 9 — 14... 3 — 1832

(Eleventh Parliament.)

Vol. 15 to 20... 4 Will. IV....... 1833
— 21 — 25... 5 — 1834

(Twelfth Parliament.)

Vol. 26 to 30... 6 Will. IV....... 1835
— 31 — 35... 7 — 1836
— 36 — 38... 8 — 1837

REIGN OF VICTORIA—1837 to 1901.

(Thirteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	39 to 44	1	Victoria	1838
—	45 — 50	2	—	1839
—	51 — 55	3	—	1840
—	56 — 58	4	—	(a) 1841

(Fourteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	59	4	Victoria	(b) 1841
—	60 to 65	5	—	1842
—	66 — 71	6	—	1843
—	72 — 76	7	—	1844
—	77 — 82	8	—	1845
—	83 — 88	9	—	1846
—	89 — 94	10	—	(a) 1847

(Fifteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	95	10	Victoria	(b) 1847
	96 to 101	11	—	1848
—	102 — 107	12	—	1849
—	108 — 113	13	—	1850
—	114 — 118	14	—	1851
—	119 — 122	15	—	(a) 1852

(Sixteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	123	15	Victoria	(b) 1852
—	124 to 129	16	—	1853
—	130 — 135	17	—	1854
—	136 — 139	18	—	1855
—	140 — 143	19	—	1856
—	144	20	—	(a) 1857

(Seventeenth Parliament.)

Vol.	145 to 147	20	Victoria	(b) 1857
—	148 — 151	21	—	1858
—	152 — 153	22	—	(a) 1859

(Eighteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	154 to 155	22	Victoria	(b) 1859
—	156 — 160	23	—	1860
—	161 — 164	24	—	1861
—	165 — 168	25	—	1862
—	169 — 172	26	—	1863
—	173 — 176	27	—	1864
—	177 — 180	28	—	1865

(Nineteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	181 to 184	29	Victoria	1866
—	185 — 189	30	—	1867
—	190 — 193	31	—	1867-8

(Twentieth Parliament.)

Vol.	194 to 198	32	Victoria	1868-9
—	199 — 203	33	—	1870
—	204 — 208	34	—	1871
—	209 — 213	35	—	1872
—	214 — 217	36	—	1873

(Twenty-First Parliament.)

Vol.	218 to 221	37	Victoria	1874
—	222 — 226	38	—	1875
—	227 — 231	39	—	1876
—	232 — 236	40	—	1877
—	237 — 242	41	—	1878
—	243 — 249	42	—	1878-9
—	250 & 251	43	—	(a) 1880

(Twenty-Second Parliament.)

Vol.	252 to 256	43	Victoria	(b) 1880
—	257 — 265	44	—	1881
—	266 — 273	45	—	(a) 1882
—	274 & 275	45	—	(b) 1882
—	276 to 283	46	—	1883
—	284 — 292	47	—	1884
—	293 — 301	48	—	1884-5

(Twenty-Third Parliament.)

Vol.	302 to 307	49	Victoria	(a) 1886

(Twenty-Fourth Parliament.)

Vol.	308 & 309	49	Victoria	(b) 1886
—	310 to 321	50	—	1887
—	322 — 332	51	—	1888
—	333 — 340	52	—	1889
—	341 — 348	53	—	1890
—	349 — 356	54	—	1890-1

Fourth Series.

(Twenty-Fourth Parliament—*cont.*)

Vol.	1 to 6	55	Victoria	1892

(Twenty-Fifth Parliament.)

Vol.	7	56	Victoria	1892
—	8 to 21	57	—	1893-4
—	22 — 29	57	—	1894
—	30 — 35	58	—	1895

(Twenty-Sixth Parliament.)

Vol.	36	59	Victoria	1895
—	37 to 44	59	—	1895-6
—	45 — 52	60	—	1897
—	53 — 65	61	—	1898
—	66 — 76	62	—	1899
—	77	63	—	1899
—	78 — 83	63	—	1900
—	84	63 & 64	—	1900
—	85 — 87	64	—	1900

(Twenty-Seventh Parliament.)

Vol.	88	64	Victoria	1900

REIGN OF EDWARD VII.

(Twenty-Seventh Parliament—*cont.*)

Vol.	89	1	Edward VII.	1901
—	90 to 100	1	—	1901
—	101	1 & 2	—	1902
—	102 to 117	2	—	1902
—	118 to 128	3	—	1903
—	129 to 134	4	—	1904

HIS MAJESTY'S PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF STATE, Etc.

THE CABINET.

Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury——Rt. Hon. Arthur J. Balfour.
Lord President of the Council and President of the Board of Education——Most Hon. the Marquess of Londonderry, K.G.
Lord Chancellor——Rt. Hon. Earl of Halsbury.
Secretaries of State——
  Foreign Affairs——Most Hon. the Marquess of Lansdowne, K.G.
  Home Department——Rt. Hon. A. Akers-Douglas, M.P.
  Colonial——Rt. Hon. Alfred Lyttelton, M.P.
  War——Rt. Hon. H. O. Arnold-Forster, M.P.
  India——Rt. Hon. W. St. John Brodrick, M.P.
Chancellor of the Exchequer——Rt. Hon. J. Austen Chamberlain, M.P.
First Lord of the Admiralty——Rt. Hon. Earl of Selborne.
Lord Chancellor of Ireland——Rt. Hon. Lord Ashbourne.
President of the Board of Trade——Rt. Hon. Gerald W. Balfour, M.P.
Postmaster-General——Rt Hon. Lord Stanley, M.P.
Secretary for Scotland——Rt. Hon. A. Graham Murray, M.P.
President of the Local Government Board——Rt. Hon. Walter H. Long, M.P.
President of the Board of Agriculture——Rt. Hon. Earl of Onslow.
Chief Secretary for Ireland——Rt. Hon. George Wyndham, M.P.
Lord Privy Seal——Most Hon. the Marquess of Salisbury.

NOT IN THE CABINET.

Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury——Sir A. Acland-Hood, Bt., M.P.
Financial Secretary to the Treasury——Victor Cavendish, Esq., M.P.
Secretary of the Board of Education——Sir William Anson, M.P.
Secretary to the Admiralty——E. G. Pretyman, Esq., M.P.
Lords of the Treasury——
  Lord Balcarres, M.P.
  Hon. Ailwyn Fellowes, M.P.
  H. W. Forster, Esq., M.P.
Lords of the Admiralty——
  Admiral Lord W. T. Kerr, K.C.B.
  Rear-Admiral Sir C. C. Drury, K.C.S.I.
  Rear-Admiral W. H. May, M.V.O.
  Rear-Admiral John Durnford, C.B., D.S.O.
Army Council——
  The Secretary of State for War [*in the Cabinet*].
  Lt.-Gen. Sir N. G. Lyttelton, K.C.B.
  Major-General C. W. H. Douglas.
  Major-General H. C. O. Plumer, C.B.
  Major-General Sir J. W. Murray, K.C.B.
  The Under-Secretary of State for War.
  The Financial Secretary to the War Office.
  Secretary. The Permanent Under-Secretary of State for War (Col. Sir E. W. D. Ward, K.C.B.).
Civil Lord of the Admiralty——Arthur H. Lee, Esq., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary, Foreign Office——Earl Percy, M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary, Home Office——Hon. T. H. Cochrane, M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary, Colonial Office——His Grace the Duke of Marlborough.
Parliamentary Secretary, India Office——Rt. Hon. Earl of Hardwicke.
Parliamentary Secretary, War Office——Rt. Hon. Earl of Donoughmore.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade——A. Bonar Law, Esq., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Local Government Board——J. Grant Lawson, Esq., M.P.
Financial Secretary, War Office——W. Bromley Davenport, Esq., M.P.
Attorney-General——Sir R. B. Finlay, K.C., M.P.
Solicitor-General——Rt. Hon. Sir E. Carson, K.C., M.P.
Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland——Rt. Hon. Earl of Dudley.
The Lord Advocate——C. Scott Dickson, Esq., K.C., M.P.
Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster——Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. Walrond, Bt., M.P.

OTHER OFFICERS OF STATE.

Judge Advocate-General——Rt. Hon. Sir F. H. Jeune, K.C.B., President Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty Division.
Lord Chamberlain——Rt. Hon. Earl of Clarendon.
Vice-Chamberlain——Rt. Hon. Lord Wolverton.
Lord Steward——Rt. Hon. Earl of Pembroke and Montgomery, G.C.V.O.
Master of the Horse——His Grace the Duke of Portland, K.G., G.C.V.O.
Paymaster-General——Sir Savile Crossley, Bt., M.V.O., M.P.
Comptroller of the Household——Viscount Valentia, M.P.
Treasurer of the Household——The Marquess of Hamilton, M.P.
Captain Yeomen of the Guard—Rt. Hon. Earl Waldegrave.

Lords-in-Waiting——
- Rt. Hon. Earl of Kintore, G.C.M.G.
- Rt. Hon. Earl of Denbigh.
- Rt. Hon. Lord Churchill, K.C.V.O.
- Rt. Hon. Earl Howe.
- Rt. Hon. Lord Lawrence.
- Rt. Hon. Lord Bagot.
- Rt. Hon. Lord Suffield, G.C.V.O., K.C.B.
- Rt. Hon. Lord Kenyon.

SCOTLAND.

Secretary for Scotland and Keeper of the Great Seal——Rt. Hon. A. Graham Murray.
Lord Justice-General——Rt. Hon. Lord Kinross.
Lord Advocate——Rt. Hon. C. Scott Dickson, Esq., K.C., M.P.
Lord Justice Clerk——Rt. Hon. Lord Kinsburgh, C.B.
Lord Clerk Register——His Grace the Duke of Montrose, K.T.
Lord High Commissioner——Rt. Hon. Earl of Leven and Melville.
Solicitor-General——David Dundas, Esq., K.C.

IRELAND.

Lord Lieutenant——Rt. Hon. Earl of Dudley.
Lord Chancellor——Rt. Hon. Lord Ashbourne.
Chief Secretary and Keeper of Privy Seal——Rt. Hon. George Wyndham, M.P.
Under Secretary——Sir Antony McDonnell, G.C.S.I.
Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction——President: The Rt. Hon. the Chief Secretary for Ireland; Vice-President: Rt. Hon. Horace Plunkett.
Attorney-General——Rt. Hon. J. Atkinson, K.C., M.P.
Solicitor-General——J. H. M. Campbell, Esq., K.C., M.P.

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS.

Chairman of Committees——Rt. Hon. Earl of Morley.
Clerk of Parliaments——Sir Henry J. L. Graham, K.C.B.
Deputy Clerk of Parliaments (Clerk Assistant)——Hon. E. P. Thesiger, C.B.
Reading-Clerk and Clerk of Outdoor Committees——Edward Hall Alderson, Esq.
Counsel to the Chairman of Committees——Albert Gray, Esq.
Chief Clerk and Clerk of Public Bills——A. Harrison, Esq.
Senior Clerks——
- Peers' Printed Paper Office——C. L. Anstruther, Esq.
- Principal Clerk, Judicial Department, and Taxing Officer of Judicial Costs——J. F. Skene, Esq.
- Clerk of the Journals——W. A. Leigh, Esq.
- Principal Clerk of Private Committees——J. F. Symons Jeune, Esq.

Other Clerks——W. H. Hamilton Gordon, Esq.; Hon. A. McDonnell; A. H. Robinson, Esq. (Clerk of Private Bills); H. P. St. John, Esq.; V. M. Biddulph, Esq.; Hon. E. A. Stonor; H. J. F. Badeley, Esq.; C. Headlam, Esq.; J. B. Hotham, Esq.; E. C. Vigors, Esq.; A. Tennyson, Esq.; and G. D. Luard, Esq.
Accountant and Copyist——Mr. T. A. Court.
Assistant Copyists——Mr. H. P. Norris and Mr. R. A. Court.
Messengers——Messrs. A. A. Worfell, C. E. Chizlett, A. M. Stoll, J. W. F. Locke, J. McMillan, G. Bennett, G. T. Philip.
Librarian——Edmund Gosse, Esq.
Assistant Librarian——A. H. M. Butler, Esq.
Attendant——Mr. W. Worfell.

Examiners for Standing Orders——C. W. CAMPION, Esq.; J. F. SYMONS JEUNE, Esq.; Clerk ——B. H. FELL, Esq.
Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod——Gen. Sir MICHAEL A. S. BIDDULPH, G.C.B.
Yeoman Usher——Captain T. D. BUTLER.
Serjeant-at-Arms——Lt.-Col. Rt. Hon. Sir FLEETWOOD I. EDWARDS, G.C.V.O., K.C.B.
Deputy Serjeant-at-Arms——S. HAND, Esq.
Resident Superintendent——J K. WILLIAMS, Esq.
Shorthand Writer——W H. GURNEY SALTER, Esq.
Principal Doorkeepers——Messrs. W. CHANDLER, E. FOX, F. HOLMAN.
First Class Assistants——Messrs. C. WALKER, J. HEDLEY, J. LANE, B. GALLOP.
Second Class Assistants——Messrs. H. B. STREVENS, G. W. CROSS, W. STOPP.
Third Class Assistants——Messrs. J. WOOLACOTT, A. A. EDNEY, J. F. BAUM.
Messengers——Messrs. A. J. SOLMAN, J. B. FORSYTH, C. CHAPMAN, W. PHILLIPS, W. W. MEATES.
Superintendent of Refreshment Rooms——Mr. W. CASBON.
Inspector of Police attending the House of Lords——Mr. A. PALMER.
Clerk of the Works, Houses of Parliament——Mr. C. J. WILLIAMS.
Resident Engineer, Houses of Parliament——Mr. A. P. PATEY.

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Clerk of the House of Commons——Sir COURTNEY PEREGRINE ILBERT, K.C.S.I., C.I.E.
Clerk-Assistant——ARTHUR W. NICHOLSON, Esq.
Second Clerk-Assistant——T. L. WEBSTER, Esq.
Principal Clerks——
    Public Bill Office, and Clerk of Fees——W. GIBBONS, Esq., C.B.
    Clerk of the Journals——W. H. LEY, Esq.
    Committee Office——R. DICKINSON, Esq.
    Private Bill Office——J. H. W. SOMERSET, Esq.
Senior Clerks——F. ST. GEORGE TUPPER, Esq.; H. C. TOWER Esq.; C. V. FRERE, Esq.; L. T. LE MARCHANT, Esq.; G. C. GIFFARD, Esq.; Sir E. H. DOYLE, Bart.
Assistant Clerks——S. L. SIMEON, Esq.; ARTHUR I. DASENT, Esq.; E. C. HOWE BROWNE, Esq.; HORACE WEST, Esq.; HENRY A. FERGUSON-DAVIE, Esq.; ARTHUR H. ELLIS, Esq.; PERCY A. BULL, Esq.; F. R. WILLIAMS WYNN, Esq.; W. E. GREY, Esq.; F C. HOLLAND, Esq.; J. W. G. BOND, Esq.
Junior Clerks——H. C. DAWKINS, Esq.; R. P. COLOMB, Esq.; B. H. FELL, Esq.; R. E CHILDERS, Esq.; J. SCOTT PORTER, Esq.; F. C. BRAMWELL, Esq.; W. T. LEGGE, Esq. C. R. TURNER, Esq.; W. K. GIBBONS, Esq.; A. E. A. W. SMYTH, Esq.; K. J. C. MOORSOM, Esq.; R. D. RADCLIFFE, Esq.
Serjeant-at-Arms——H. D. ERSKINE, Esq., C.V.O.
Deputy Serjeant——F. R. GOSSET, Esq.
Assistant Sergeant——W. H. ERSKINE, Esq.
Office Messenger——Mr. C. J. H. SHEARN.
Chaplain to the House——The Ven. Archdeacon BASIL WILBERFORCE, D.D.
Secretary to the Speaker——EDWARD GULLY, Esq., C.B.
Counsel to the Speaker——Hon. Sir E. CHANDOS LEIGH, K.C., K.C.B.
Trainbearer——Mr. J. FRENCH.
Messenger——Mr. W. MURRELL.
Collectors of Fees on Private Bills——C. L. LOCKTON, Esq.
Clerk to Referees——Sir E. H. DOYLE, Bart.
Examiners of Private Bills——C. W. CAMPION, Esq.; J. F. SYMONS JEUNE, Esq.
Taxing Master——C. W. CAMPION, Esq.; Clerk——B. H. FELL, Esq.
Vote Office——
    Principal Clerk——PHILIP SMITH, Esq.
    Assistant Clerks——H. OTWAY MAYNE, Esq.; JOHN POYSER, Esq.
    Messenger——Mr. JOHN EDWARDS.
Librarian——R. C. WALPOLE, Esq.; Assistant Librarian——TEMPLE FRANKS, Esq., B.C.L.; Clerks in Library——Messrs. J. R. CRIMP, WM. STEWART; Messengers——Messrs. A. FIRMIN, W. HAGUE.
Shorthand Writer——W. H. GURNEY SALTER, Esq.
Printers——
    Journals——G. E. BRISCOE EYRE, Esq.
    Votes——J. B. NICHOLS, Esq.
Postmaster——Mr. I. LINCOLN; Hall Keeper——Mr. J. GLYNN.
Office Keeper——Mr. H. BULLOCK.
Office Clerk in Committee Office——Mr. T. FIELDEN MITCHELL.
Office Clerk in Journal Office——Mr. A. A. TAYLOR.
Messengers——Messrs. C. DAVIE, W. QUANTRILL, H. JONES, G. D. WELLER, J. ARMSTRONG, J. WOODWARD, J. IVORY, G NORMAN, J. SURREY, A. SEPPLE.
Doorkeepers——Mr. W. WILSON and Mr. M. INGLEFIELD.

Messengers (1st Class)——Mr. H. HAMBLING, Mr. C. WOODCRAFT, Mr. R. ROBERTSON, Mr. J. HILLS, Mr. J. SPRAGUE, Mr. A. ANDREWS, Mr. T. B. SPRAY, Mr. G. TYE, Mr. R. HOBBY, Mr. G. ANSTEY, Mr. J. H. DAY.

Messengers (2nd Class)——Messrs. J. HENDERSON, G. WAINWRIGHT, J. GUYATT, R. TURTLE, A. HASKELL, A. C. JOHNSON, G. CLAPPERTON, H. E. LININGTON, H. G. EMMETT.

Superintendent of Members' Waiting Room——Mr. J. F. HENLEY; Assistant——Mr W. BROADBENT; Porters——Messrs. J. ORAM and J. HART.

Chief Inspector of Police attending the House of Commons——Mr. SCANTLEBURY.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TO

VOLUME CXXXIV.

SIXTH VOLUME OF SESSION, 1904.

HOUSE OF LORDS: FRIDAY, 29TH APRIL, 1904.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Page

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with :—London County Council (Money); Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London) [H.L.].

Also the Certificate that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have not been complied with :—City of London (Central Criminal Court House).

And also the Certificate that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with :—Amersham, Beaconsfield, and District Water

The same were ordered to lie on the Table 1

Newcastle and Gateshead Water Bill [H.L.].—A witness ordered to attend the Select Committee 1

City of London (Central Criminal Court House) Bill.—Examiners' Certificate of non-compliance with the Standing Orders referred to the Standing Orders Committee on Thursday next 2

Harrogate Waterworks Tramroad Bill [H.L.].—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments 2

Leeds Corporation (Waterworks) Railway Bill [H.L.].—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments 2

Cardiff Railway Bill [H.L.].—Report from the Select Committee, That the Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the Bill, the opposition thereto having been withdrawn; read, and ordered to lie on the Table. The orders made on the 19th of February and 24th March last discharged, and Bill committed 2

Apr. 29.] *Page*

Manchester Ship Canal (Finance) Bill [H.L.].—Ebbw Vale Urban District Water Bill [H.L.]; Shipley Urban District Council Bill [H.L.]. Read 3ª, and passed, and sent to the Commons 2

Great Northern and City Railway (Extension of Time) Bill.—Corbridge Gas Bill. Read 3ª, and passed 2

Hampton-in-Arden Gas Bill.—Read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons 3

Local Government Provisional Order (Poor Law) Bill.—Brought from the Commons; read 1ª; to be printed; and referred to the Examiners. (No. 59.) 3

Great Yarmouth Corporation Bill [H.L.].—Report from the Select Committee, That the Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the Bill, no parties having appeared in opposition thereto; read, and ordered to lie on the Table. The orders made on the 11th of March and Friday last discharged, and Bill committed 3

Mullingar, Kells, and Drogheda Railway Bill.—Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Bill. Brought from the Commons; read 1ª; and referred to the Examiners 3

Neath, Pontardawe, and Brynaman Railway Bill [H.L.].—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments 3

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (Birmingham) Bill [H.L.].–A Bill to confirm a Provisional Order made by the Board of Education under the Education Acts, 1870 to 1903, to enable the Council of the City and County Borough of Birmingham to put in force the Lands Clauses Acts, was presented by the Earl of Onslow (for the Lord President (E. Vane [M. Londonderry]); read 1ª; to be printed; and referred to the Examiners. (No. 56.) 3

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill [H.L.].—(No. 57). A Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Electric Lighting Acts, 1882 and 1888, relating to Ashford (Kent), Ely, Ham, Hexham, Horley, Keynsham (Somerset), Kingswood, Newton Abbot (Extension), Teignmouth (Amendment), and Walton-upon-Thames; and 3

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill [H.L.].—(No. 58.) A Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Electric Lighting Acts, 1882 and 1888, the Electric Lighting (Scotland Act), 1890, and the Electric Lighting (Scotland) Act, 1902, relating to Musselburgh, Portpatrick, and Wishaw 3

Were presented by the Earl Waldegrave (for the Lord Wolverton); read 1ª; to be printed; and referred to the Examiners 4

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

NAVY (HYDROGRAPHER'S REPORT).—Report on Admiralty Surveys for the year 1903, by the Hydrographer 4

HISTORICAL MANUSCRIPTS (ROYAL COMMISSION).—Calendar of the manuscripts of the most hon. the Marquess of Salisbury, preserved at Hatfield House, Hertfordshire. Part X.
Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 4

ROYAL PARKS AND GARDENS.—Rules in connection with the regulations prescribed by " The Parks Regulation Act, 1872 " 4

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (IRELAND).—Order with respect to the urban county district of Enniskillen.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table .. 4

UNIVERSITIES OF OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE ACT, 1877.—Statutes made by the Governing Body of Trinity College, Cambridge, on the 7th December, 1903, amending Statutes XXVIII., XXIX., XXXI., XLI., XLII., XLIX., LIV., and LXI. of the Statutes of the College.

Statutes made by the Governing Body of the Brasenose College, Oxford, on the 9th December, 1903, amending Statutes II., III., IV., V., X., XII., XIII., XV., XVI., and XVII. of the Statutes of the College.

Statutes made by the Governing Body of Balliol College, Oxford, on the 15th December, 1903, amending Statute V., Clause 3 (A) of the Statutes of the College.

Laid before the House (pursuant to the Act), and to be printed. (No. 55) .. 4

SALVAGE CLAIMS AGAINST VESSELS OF THE CROWN.

Lord Muskerry 5
The Under Secretary of State for the Colonies (*The Duke of Marlborough*) 7

House adjourned at a quarter before Five o'clock to Monday next, a quarter before Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: FRIDAY, 29TH APRIL, 1904.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).—MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz.:—Preston and Blackburn Tramways Bill [Lords]. Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time 9

PRIVATE BILL PETITIONS (STANDING ORDERS NOT COMPLIED WITH).—MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the Petition for the following Bill, the Standing Orders have not been complied with, viz.:—City of London (Central Criminal Court House). Ordered That the Report be referred to the Select Committee on Standing Orders 9

Apr. 29.] Page

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH).—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz. :—Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill. Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time upon Monday next 9

Great Central Railway Bill (King's Consent signified).—Bill read the third time, and passed 9

Harrow Road and Paddington Tramways Bill.—Humber Commercial Railway and Dock Bill. Read the third time, and passed 9

Barnet District Gas and Water Bill.—Donegal Railway Bill ; Ipswich Dock Commission Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered ; to be read the third time 10

Weston-super-Mare Grand Pier Bill [LORDS] (by Order).—Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment 10

Crystal Palace District Gas Bill.—Tottenham Improvement Bill ; Gosport Water Bill [Lords] ; Metropolitan Railway Bill [Lords]. Reported, with Amendments ; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 10

West Metropolitan Railway (Abandonment) Bill [LORDS].—Reported, with an Amendment ; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed .. 10

Victoria University of Manchester Bill [LORDS].—Reported, without Amendment ; Report to lie upon the Table

Bill to be read the third time 10

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill.—Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed] ; Report to lie upon the Table

Bill to be read the third time upon Monday next 10

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.—That they have passed a Bill, intituled " An Act to confer further powers upon the Lancashire Electric Power Company ; and for other purposes." [Lancashire Electric Power Bill [Lords] .. 10

Lancashire Electric Power Bill [LORDS].—Read the first time ; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills 10

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Stornoway, for alteration ; to lie upon the Table 10

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Dundee, in favour ; to lie upon the Table 10

LAND VALUES TAXATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Lanark, in favour, to lie upon the Table 11

Apr. 29.] *Page*

LICENCES (RENEWAL).—Petitions against alteration of Law; from Oldham; Southampton; Shirley; Lewes (two); Kensington; West Ealing; Felling on Tyne; Hackney; and Strood; to lie upon the Table 11

LICENSING BILL.—Petition from Deeside, against; to lie upon the Table .. 11

RAILWAYS (PRIVATE SIDINGS) BILL.—Petition from Birmingham, in favour; to lie upon the Table 11

RATING OF MACHINERY BILL.—Petition from Leicestershire, in favour; to lie upon the Table 11

SALE OF BUTTER BILL.—Petition from Sheffield, against; to lie upon the Table 11

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

LABOURERS' COTTAGES (IRELAND).—Returns [presented 28th April] to be printed. [No. 148.] 11

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (IRELAND).—Copy presented, of Order of the Local Government Board for Ireland with respect to the Urban County District of Enniskillen [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 11

ROYAL PARKS AND GARDENS.—Copy presented of Rules for the Royal Parks and Gardens in connection with the Regulations prescribed by The Parks Regulation Act, 1872 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 11

UNIVERSITIES OF OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE ACT, 1877 (CAMBRIDGE).—Copy presented, of Statutes made by the Governing Body of Trinity College, Cambridge, on 7th December, 1903, amending Statutes XXVIII., XXIX., XXXI., XLI., XLII., XLIX., LIV., and XLI. of the College Statutes [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 149]. 11

UNIVERSITIES OF OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE ACT, 1877 (OXFORD).—Copy presented, of Statutes made by the Governing Body of Brasenose College, Oxford, on 9th December, 1903, amending Statutes II., III., IV., V., X., XII., XIII., XV., XVI., and XVII. of the College Statutes [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 150] 12

UNIVERSITIES OF OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE ACT, 1877 (OXFORD).—Copy presented, of Statute made by the Governing Body of Balliol College, Oxford, on 15th December, 1903, amending Statute V., Clause 3 (a), of the Statutes of the College [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 151] 12

HISTORICAL MANUSCRIPTS (ROYAL COMMISSION).—Copy presented, of Calendar of the Manuscripts of the most hon. the Marquess of Salisbury, preserved at Hatfield House, Hertfordshire. Part X. [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 12

NAVY (HYDROGRAPHER'S REPORT).—Copy presented, of Report on Admiralty Surveys for the year 1903 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 12

Apr. 29.] *Page*

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

GRIEVANCES OF IRISH POOR LAW MEDICAL OFFICERS.—Question, Dr. Thompson (Monaghan, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham .. ..

ARREST OF PRIVATE CHURCHILL, 1ST DRAGOON GUARDS.—Question, Sir Thomas Roe (Derby); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 13

LICENSING BILL—QUARTER SESSIONAL DIVISIONS.—Question, Dr. Hutchinson (Sussex, Rye); Answer, Mr. Akers-Douglas 13

DEATHS FROM BURNS CAUSED BY OPEN GRATES.—Question, Mr. Arthur Henderson (Durham, Barnard Castle); Answer, Mr. Akers-Douglas 13

ALIENS IN BRITISH PRISONS.—Question, Sir Thomas Dewar (Tower Hamlets, St. George's); Answer, Mr. Akers-Douglas 14

DISPOSAL OF MONEY FOUND ON POST OFFICE COUNTERS.—Question, Mr. James O'Connor (Wicklow, W.); Answer, Lord Stanley 14

EXTENSION OF TELEPHONE SYSTEM IN IRELAND.—Question, Mr. O'Doherty (Donegal, N.); Answer, Lord Stanley 14

BUNERANA AND CARNDONAGH RAILWAY—APPOINTMENT OF ARBITRATORS.—Question, Mr. O'Doherty; Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 15

IRISH BOARD OF WORKS.—Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde (Wexford, N.); Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 15

IRISH FISHERIES—CLOSE SEASON AND DISTRICT.—Question, Mr. O'Doherty; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 16

MILITIA AND VOLUNTEERS—REPORT OF COMMISSION—GOVERNMENT'S DECISION.—Question, Mr. Reginald Lucas (Portsmouth); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 16

REPORT OF NEW SOUTH WALES COMMISSION ON THE DECLINE OF THE BIRTH RATE.—Question, Mr. D. A. Thomas (Merthyr Tydvil); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 17

IMMIGRANTS INTO CANADA.—Question, Mr. D. A. Thomas; Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 17

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) ACTS AMENDMENT BILL—[SECOND READING].—Order for Second Reading read.

Mr. Field (Dublin, St. Patrick) 17
Mr. Hayden (Roscommon, S.) 23

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Sir James Haslett (Belfast, N.) 27
Mr. Murphy (Kerry, E.) 28
Mr. T. W. Russell (Tyrone, S.) 29
Mr. Blake (Longford, S.) 31

Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.) 31
Mr. Chas. Craig (Antrim, S.) 32
Colonel Kenyon-Slaney (Shropshire, Newport) 34
Mr. T. L. Corbett (Down, N.) 36
Sir Frederick Banbury (Camberwell, Peckham) 38
Mr. Joseph Devlin (Kilkenny) 41
The Attorney-General for Ireland (Mr. Atkinson, Londonderry, N.) .. 44
Mr. T. P. O'Connor (Liverpool, Scotland) 53
Colonel Saunderson (Armagh, N.) 55
Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.) 60
Mr. Hemphill (Tyrone, N.) 64
Mr. Heywood Johnston (Sussex, Horsham) 67

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 137 ; Noes, 205. (Division List No. 101.)

Liquor Traffic Local Veto (Scotland) Bill—[SECOND READING].—Order for Second Reading read

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Debate to be resumed upon Wednesday next 71

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

First Report brought up, and read. Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 152.]

Adjourned at twenty-eight minutes before Six o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS: MONDAY, 2ND MAY, 1904.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with :—

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 1) [H.L.].

Also the Certificate that no further Standing Orders are applicable to the following Bill :—

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 1).

And also the Certificates that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with :—
Thurles Urban District Council Water ; Wolverhampton Corporation.

The same were ordered to lie on the Table 73

Scarisbrick Estate (Amendment) Bill [H.L.].—Bill, approved by the Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice, presented, on petition, and read 1ª .. 73

Apr. 29.]

West Riding Tramways Bill [H.L.].—The King's consent signified ; and Bill reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments .. .. ..

Hutchesons' Hospital and Hutchesons' Educational Trust Bill [H.L.] ;—South Shields Gas Bill ; Chippenham Gas Bill ; Sheppy Gas Bill ; North Staffordshire Railway Bill ; London, Tilbury, and Southend Railway Bill Report from the Committee of Selection, That the following Lords be proposed to the House to form the Select Committee for the consideration of the said Bills ; (viz.), E. Bathurst ; E. Lathom ; V. Falmouth ; L. Clonbrock ; L. Brougham and Vaux (chairman). Agreed to ; and the said Lords appointed accordingly. The Committee to meet on Tuesday the 10th of May next at Eleven o'clock ; and all petitions referred to the Committee, with leave to the petitioners praying to be heard by counsel against the Bills to be heard as desired, as also counsel for the Bills .. ..

Richard Jaeger's Patent Bill [H.L.].—Read 2^a .. ..

Norwich Water Bill.—Read 3^a, and passed .. ..

South Staffordshire Mines Drainage Bill [H.L.].—Maidenhead Bridge Bill [H.L.] Read 3^a, and passed, and sent to the Commons 7

Great Eastern Railway (Steamboats) Bill.—Read 3^a, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons 7

Great Central Railway Bill.—Harrow Road and Paddington Tramways Bill ; Humber Commercial Railway and Dock Bill. Brought from the Commons ; read 1^a, and referred to the Examiners 7

Weston super-Mare Grand Pier Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to 7

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill [H.L.] (No. 60).—A Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Electric Lighting Acts, 1882 and 1888, relating to Cleveden, Portishead and Long Ashton, Crediton, Devizes, Hampton Wick and District, Houghton-le-Spring and District, the Maldens and Coombe, Northampton and District, Stroud, Nailsworth and Dursley, and Trowbridge (Urban). Bradford-on-Avon (Urban), and Bradford-on-Avon (Rural) ..

Water Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.].—(No. 61).—A Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Gas and Water Works Facilities Act, 1870, relating to Bradfield Water, Cholderton and District Water, Elham Valley Water, Frimley and Farnborough District Water, and North Sunderland Water .. ..

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.] (No. 62).—A Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Gas and Water Works Facilities Act, 1870, relating to Rainham Water, Sevenoaks Water, Southwold Water, Wetherby District Water, and Meldreth and Melbourne District Gas and Water .. ..

Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [H.L.] (No. 63).—A Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Gas and Water Works Facilities Act, 1870, relating to Bognor Gas, Elham Valley Gas, Elstree and Boreham Wood Gas, Finedon Gas, and Godalming Gas .. ..

Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [H.L.] (No. 64).—A Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Gas and Water Works Facilities Act, 1870, relating to Gray's Gas, Hedon Gas, Northampton Gas, Rochford Gas, and Romford Gas ; and

Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 3) Bill [H.L.] (No. 65).—A Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Gas and Water Works Facilities Act, 1870, relating to St. Margaret's Gas, Stirling Gas, Waltham Abbey Gas, and Cheshunt Gas, Worsbroughdale and Worsbrough Gas, and Worthing Gas .. ..

Were presented by the Lord Wolverton ; read 1ª ; to be printed ; and referred to the Examiners 74

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Trade Reports (Annual Series).

No. 3148. Greece (Thessaly).

No. 3149. France (Cherbourg).

No. 3150. Switzerland. 75

India (Tibet).

I. Further Papers relating to Tibet (in continuation of [Cd. 1920.]) ;

II. (Royal Indian Engineering College)—

Reports and correspondence relating to the expediency of maintaining the Royal Indian Engineering College, and other matters.

Minutes of evidence taken before the Committee appointed in 1903, to inquire into the expediency of maintaining the Royal Indian Engineering College, and other matters ; together with an analysis and index of the evidence. 75

Evictions (Ireland).—Return of evictions in Ireland, for the quarter ended 31st March, 1904 75

Royal University of Ireland.—Royal Warrant approving of alterations in the Statutes 76

Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1887 (Eviction Notices).—Return of the number of eviction notices filed during the quarter ended 31st March, 1904 76

Railway Returns (Preliminary Statement).
Return relating to the railways of the United Kingdom, for the year 1903.
Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 76

Barbados.—Amended prison rules relating to visits and instruction of the chaplain, the officer's reward fund, and labour for juvenile offenders .. 76

Gas Companies (Metropolis).

Account of the metropolitan gas companies for the year 1903.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table .. 76

May 2.] Page

Sale of Intoxicants to Children Bill [H.L.].—Amendments reported (according to order), and Bill to be read 3ª on Thursday next 76

THE LIGHT LOAD-LINE.

Lord Muskerry 76

Moved to resolve, "That, in the opinion of this House, His Majesty's Government thould at once take the necessary steps in enforcing the recommendations contained in Clause 6 of the Report of the Select Committee on the Light Load-line in a proper and effective manner."—(*Lord Muskerry.*)

Lord Wolverton 81
Earl Spencer 82
The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (*The Marquess of Lansdowne*) 83
Lord Muskerry 84
Lord Ellenborough 84

Motion, by leave of the House, withdrawn.

Sea Fisheries Bill [H.L.].—Bill read 3ª (according to order).

The President of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries (*The Earl of Onslow*) 85

Amendment moved—

"At the end of Clause 1, to add, as a new sub-section, the words 'Any member of the Royal Irish Constabulary or of the Dublin Metropolitan Police may, with the consent of the Lord-Lieutenant, be appointed as an officer for the purposes of this section, subject to such orders and restrictions as may be made with the approval of the Lord-Lieutenant, in the case of a member of the Royal Irish Constabulary, by the Inspector-General thereof, and in the case of a member of the Dublin Metropolitan Police, by the Chief Commissioner thereof.'"—(*The Earl of Onslow.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Bill passed and sent to the Commons.

House adjourned at ten minutes past Five o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: MONDAY, 2ND MAY, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).—MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, orginating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz:—Barnard Castle Gas Bill [Lords]. Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time 85

May 2.] *Page*

Barry Railway (Extension of Time, etc.) Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment 86

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill.—As amended, considered; to be read the third time 86

Southport and Lytham Tramroad (Extension of Time) Bill [Lords.]—Read a second time, and committed 86

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill.—Read the third time, and passed 86

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill.—Read a second time, and committed 86

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6).—Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the County Palatine of Lancaster and the Counties of Rutland and Surrey, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Grant Lawson and Mr. Walter Long.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill.—"To confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the County Palatine of Lancaster and the Counties of Rutland and Surrey," presented, and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 168.] 86

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 7).—Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to Godalming, Haworth, Northallerton, and Tipton, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Grant Lawson and Mr. Walter Long.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill.—"To conrm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to Godalming, Haworth, Northallerton, and Tipton," presented, and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 169.] 86

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8).—Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to Kingswood, West Ham and the Knighton and Teme, the North-East Durham, and the South Shields Rural and Southwick-on-Wear, Joint Hospital Districts, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Grant Lawson and Mr. Walter Long.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill.—"To confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to Kingswood, West Ham and the Knighton and Teme, the North-East Durham, and the South Shields Rural and Southwick-on-Wear, Joint Hospital Districts," presented, and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 170.] 87

Local Government Provisional Orders (Gas).—Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to East Dereham and Neyland, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Grant Lawson and Mr. Walter Long .. ..

May 2.] *Page*

Local Government Provisional Orders (Gas) Bill.—" To confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to East Dereham and Neyland," presented, and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 171.] .. 87

Liverpool and London and Globe Insurance Company Bill [Lords] [Stamp Duties].—Committee to consider of authorising the imposition of a certain Stamp Duty in lieu of the Stamp Duties which would have been payable upon the deeds or assurances which, in case the Bill had not been passed into an Act, would have been required to pass to and vest in the company certain property (King's Recommendation signified), To-morrow.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*) 87

Message from the Lords.—That they have agreed to—Great Northern and City Railway (Extension of Time) Bill; Corbridge Gas Bill, without Amendment.

Hampton-in-Arden Gas Bill, with Amendments.

That they have passed a Bill intituled, " An Act to confirm and give effect to arrangements between the Corporation of Manchester and the Manchester Ship Canal Company with respect to the financial relations between the two bodies and to empower the Manchester Ship Canal Company to raise further money by borrowing and to create additional capital; and for other purposes." [Manchester Ship Canal (Finance) Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill intituled, " An Act to authorise the Urban District Council of Ebbw Vale to construct additional waterworks; and for other purposes." [Ebbw Vale Urban District Water Bill [Lords.]

And, also, a Bill, intituled, " An Act to authorise the Urban District Council of Shipley to purchase the gas undertaking of Sir Titus Salt, Bart., Sons, and Company, Limited, and to acquire land, construct street works, consolidate their loans and borrow money; and for other purposes." [Shipley Urban District Council Bill [Lords.] 87

Manchester Ship Canal (Finance) Bill [Lords]; Ebbw Vale Urban District Water Bill [Lords]; Shipley Urban District Council Bill [Lords]. Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills 88

PETITIONS.

Housing of the Working Classes, Etc., Bill.—Petition from Battersea, in favour; to lie upon the Table 88

Licensing Bill.—Petitions against; from Aberdeen (two); Forest Gate; Gloucester; High Ham; Barrowford; London; and Walworth; to lie upon the Table 88

Licences (Renewal).—Petitions against alteration of Law; from Battersea (two); Walworth; St. Pancras; Bolton; Somerton (two); Corris; and Cambridge; to lie upon the Table 88

Public Houses (Closing During Elections).—Petition from South Ockendon, for legislation; to lie upon the Table 89

May 2.] *Page*

RATING OF MACHINERY BILL.—Petition from Battersea, against ; to lie upon the Table 89

SALE OF BUTTER BILL.—Petition from Grantham, against ; to lie upon the Table 89

TRADES UNIONS AND TRADES DISPUTES BILL.—Petition from Battersea, in favour ; to lie upon the Table 89

TRADES UNIONS AND TRADE DISPUTES (NO. 2) BILL.—Petition from Battersea, in favour ; to lie upon the Table 89

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION BILL.—Petition from Battersea, in favour; to lie upon the Table 89

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BARBADOES.—Copy presented, of Amended Prison Rules relating to Visits and Instruction of the Chaplain, the Officers' Reward Fund, and Labour for Juvenile Prisoners [by Act] ; to lie upon the Table 89

RAILWAY RETURNS (PRELIMINARY STATEMENT).—Copy presented, of Return relating to the railways of the United Kingdom for the year 1903 (Preliminary Statement) [by Command] ; to lie upon the Table 89

GAS COMPANIES (METROPOLIS).—Copy presented, of Accounts of the Metropolitan Gas Companies for the year 1903 [by Act] ; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 153.] 89

EAST INDIA (TIBET).—Copy presented, of Further Papers relating to Tibet (in continuation of C. 1920) [by Command] ; to lie upon the Table 89

EAST INDIA (ROYAL INDIAN ENGINEERING COLLEGE). — Copy presented, of Minutes of Evidence taken before the Committee appointed in 1903 to inquire into the expediency of maintaining the Royal Indian Engineering College, and other matters, together with an analysis and index of the evidence [by Command] ; to lie upon the Table 90

EAST INDIA (ROYAL INDIAN ENGINEERING COLLEGE). — Copy presented, of Reports and Correspondence relating to the expediency of maintaining the Royal Indian Engineering College, and other matters [by Command] ; to lie upon the Table 90

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—Copies presented of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3148 to 3150 [by Command] ; to lie upon the Table 90

TRADE REPORTS (MISCELLANEOUS SERIES).—Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Miscellaneous Series, No. 608 [by Command] ; to lie upon the Table 90

CROWN AGENTS.—Address for " Return showing the total amount, including loans, on which any commission was charged or received by the Crown Agents for the Colonies during each of the last five years, differentiating between (1) commercial, railway, and general business ; and (2) financial, loan, and miscellaneous business ; also the total amount of commission charged or received in each year ; and also the separate totals debited and commission charged to each Colony and Protectorate in each of the said years."—(*Mr. Austin Taylor.*) 90

May 2.] Page

WOOLLEN, WORSTED, AND SHODDY FACTORIES (INSPECTION).—Address for "Return of the number of Woollen, Worsted, and Shoddy Factories subject to inspection under the Factory and Workshop Act, 1901, and the number of spindles, looms, and other machines used in such factories."—(*Mr. Wanklyn.*) 90

EVICTIONS (IRELAND).—Copy presented, of Return of the number of Evictions in Ireland for the quarter ended 31st March, 1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 91

LAND LAW (IRELAND) ACT, 1887 (EVICTION NOTICES).—Copy presented, of Return of Eviction Notices filed during the quarter ended 31st March, 1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 91

ROYAL UNIVERSITY OF IRELAND.—Copy presented, of Royal Warrant approving of alterations in the Statutes [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. 91

IRISH LAND COMMISSION (RULES).—Copy presented, of Rules made in pursuance of Section 88, Sub-section 5, of the Irish Land Act, 1903, dated 23rd April, 1904 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 91

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

POST OFFICE OFFICIALS.—Question, Mr. Thornton (Clapham); Answer, Lord Stanley 91

FEMALE LEARNERS IN POST OFFICES.—Question, Sir John Leng (Dundee); Answer, Lord Stanley 92

PENSIONS OF TEMPORARY CLERKS.—Question, Mr. Thornton; Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 92

THE BAIL ACT.—Question, Mr. Lloyd Morgan (Carmarthenshire, W.); Answer, Mr. Akers-Douglas 93

LICENCES REFUSED BUT RENEWED ON APPEAL TO QUARTER SESSIONS.—Question, Mr. Cohen (Islington, E.); Answer, Mr. Akers-Douglas 94

GUN-SIGHTS OF H.M.S. "CENTURION."—Question, Mr. Yerburgh (Chester); Answer, Mr. Pretyman 95

COST OF RAISING SUBMARINE A 1.—Question, Sir John Leng; Answer, Mr. Pretyman - 97

STATE REGISTRATION OF NURSES.—Question, Dr. Thompson (Monaghan, N.); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 97

EDUCATION AUTHORITIES NEGLECTING TO CARRY OUT THE EDUCATION ACT, 1902.—Question, Mr. Alfred Davies (Carmarthen Boroughs); Answer, Sir William Anson 98

INCOME TAX COLLECTION IN ENGLAND AND SCOTLAND.—Question, Sir J. Stirling-Maxwell (Glasgow College); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 98

COAL EXPORTS.—Question, Mr. D. A. Thomas (Merthyr Tydvil); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 98

May 2.] Page

THE NATIONAL DEBT.—Question, Mr. McCrae (Edinburgh, E.); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 99

VALUE OF LICENSED PREMISES.—Question, Mr. Peel (Manchester, S.); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 100

ALCOHOL FOR MANUFACTURING PURPOSES.—Question, Sir Ernest Flower (Bradford, W.); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 100

IMPORTS OF IMPURE TEAS.—Question, Sir Seymour King (Hull, Central); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 101

IRISH CONGESTED DISTRICTS.—Question, Dr. Thompson; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 101

YEOMANRY DRILL.—Question, Colonel Wyndham-Quin (Glamorganshire, S.); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 102

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

SUGGESTED NAVAL RESERVE BATTERY AT FRASERBURGH. — Question, Mr. Maconochie (Aberdeenshire, E.); Answer, The Civil Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. Arthur Lee, Hampshire, Fareham) 102

PAY OF ARMY NURSES.—Question, Dr. Farquharson (Aberdeenshire, W.); Answer, the Secretary of State for War (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.) 103

SCOTTISH ARMY CHAPLAINS.—Question, Captain Ellice (St. Andrews Burghs); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 103

WAR OFFICE RECONSTITUTION.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 103

DESTRUCTION OF FOOD SUPPLIES DURING SOUTH AFRICAN WAR.—Question, Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 104

IMPERIAL YEOMANRY. — Question, Mr. Seymour Ormsby-Gore (Lincolnshire, Gainsborough); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 105

THE GUARDS' CAP.—Question, Sir Carne Rasch (Essex, Chelmsford); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 105

PURCHASES FOR THE TRANSVAAL THROUGH CROWN AGENTS.—Question, Mr. Rose (Cambridgeshire, Newmarket); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Lyttelton, Warwick and Leamington) 105

TRANSVAAL ADMINISTRATION AND THE CROWN AGENTS.—Questions, Mr. Herbert Samuel (Yorkshire, Cleveland), and Mr. Austin Taylor (Liverpool, East Toxteth); Answers, Mr. Lyttelton 105

SOUTH AFRICAN CENSUS.—Questions, Major Seely (Isle of Wight); Answers, Mr. Lyttelton 107

WHITE LABOUR IN THE TRANSVAAL MINES.—Question, Major Seely; Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 107

May 2.] *Page*

CHINESE LABOUR IN THE TRANSVAAL MINES.—Question, Mr. H. J. Wilson (Yorkshire, W.R., Holmfirth), and Mr. Fenwick (Northumberland, Wansbeck); Answers, Mr. Lyttelton 107

JAMAICA—EXCISE MATCH DUTY.—Question, Mr. McKenna (Monmouthshire, N.); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton. 108

THE MISSION TO TIBET.—Question, Mr. Lambert (Devonshire, South Molton); Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) 109

THE SOMALI MULLAH AND THE MIJERTAIN TRIBE.—Question, Mr. Lambert; Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Earl Percy, Kensington, S.) 109

BRITISH GARRISON FOR SOMALILAND.—Question, Mr. William Redmond; Answer, Earl Percy 110

ILLIG.—Question, Mr. Charles Hobhouse (Bristol, E.); Answer, Earl Percy .. 110

LICENSED PREMISES—VALUATION FOR ESTATE DUTY.—Questions, Mr. Ashton (Bedfordshire, Luton) and Mr. Lambert; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) 110

BRITISH STEAMSHIP SERVICE TO EAST AFRICA.–Questions, Mr. Evelyn Cecil (Aston Manor) and Mr. Buchanan (Perthshire, E.); Answers, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 111

INQUIRY INTO DUTIES OF BOARD OF TRADE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD.—Question, Mr. Claude Hay (Shoreditch, Hoxton); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 112

DUTY ON STRIPPED TOBACCO.—Question, Mr. William Redmond; Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 112

INEBRIATE HOMES—DETENTION REGULATIONS.—Question, Mr. Lloyd Morgan (Carmarthenshire, W.); Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Cochrane, Ayrshire, N.) 113

UNNECESSARY LICENCES—REFUSALS TO RENEW.—Question, Mr. McKenna; Answer, Mr. Cochrane 113

THE LICENSING BILL.—Question, Mr. Ashton; Answer, Mr. Cochrane 114

LICENSING BILL—ANNUAL VALUE OF LICENSED PREMISES.—Questions, Mr. Herbert Roberts (Denbighshire, W.); Answers, Mr. Cochrane 114

ADMINISTRATION OF THE HOUSING ACTS.—Question, Mr. Claude Hay; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Walter Long, Bristol, S.) 115

THE RECORD BREAKING MOTOR CAR TOUR.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 116

MOTOR CARS IN HYDE PARK.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason; Answer, Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley) 116

VENTILATION OF THE VOTE.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Lord Balcarres 117

May 2.] *Page*

Welsh Education Grant.—Question, Mr. Alfred Davies (Carmarthen Boroughs) Answer, The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education (Sir William Anson, Oxford University) 117

Carmarthen County Council Education Inquiry.—Question, Mr. Alfred Davies; Answer, Sir William Anson 117

Lochcarron (Ross-shire) Water Supbly.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. Graham Murray, Buteshire) 118

Crossboat (Island of Lewis) Burial Ground.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 118

Destitution in Barvas (Island of Lewis.)—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 119

Motor Car Regulations in Scotland.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason; Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 119

Inspection of Encumbered Estates.–Questions, Mr. O'Dowd (Sligo, S.) and Mr. T. W. Russell (Tyrone, S.); Answers, The Attorney-General for Ireland (Mr. Atkinson, Londonderry, N.) 120

Irish Local Government Act—New Order in Council.—Question, Mr. Sheehy (Meath, S.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland, (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 120

Housing Question in Ireland.—Question, Mr. Nannetti (Dublin, College Green); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 120

Bloomfield Estate, Pettigo.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 121

Achonry Estate, County Sligo.—Question, Mr. O'Dowd; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 121

The Rowe Estate.—Questions, Mr. Ffrench (Wexford, S.) and Mr. T. W. Russell; Answers, Mr. Wyndham 122

Outdoor Relief in the Thurles Union.—Question, Mr. Kendal O'Brien (Tipperary, Mid.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 122

Hugh Crofton's Estate, County Cavan—Stamped Receipts for Rent and Costs.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Victor Cavendish, Derbyshire, W.) 123

Arklow Harbour.—Questions, Mr. James O'Connor (Wicklow, W.) and Mr. John Redmond (Waterford); Answers, Mr. Victor Cavendish 124

Railway Tickets from Sligo to Collooney.—Question, Mr. O'Dowd; Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central) 124

Baltimore Harbour.—Question, Mr. Gilhooly (Cork County, W.); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 125

May 2.] *Page*

LICENSING BILL.—Question, Mr. Lloyd-Morgan; Answer, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) .. 125

STATUE OF THE LATE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY.—Question, Sir M. Hicks Beach (Bristol, W.); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 126

SCOTTISH CONGESTED DISTRICTS BILL.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 126

ALLEGED BOILING OF LIVE LOBSTERS.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason; Answer, Mr. Cochrane 126

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—Questions, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs), Sir Henry Fowler (Wolverhampton, E.), Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis), and Mr. Lough (Islington, W.); Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 127

PRIVATE LEGISLATION PROCEDURE (WALES) BILL.—Ordered, That a Message be sent to the Lords to request that their Lordships will be pleased to give leave to the Lord Balfour of Burleigh to attend to be examined as a witness before the Select Committee on the Private Legislation Procedure (Wales) Bill.—(*Mr. Jeffreys*) 128

NEW BILLS.

Merchandise Marks Bill.—"To amend the sixteenth Section of the Merchandise Marks Act, 1887," presented by Sir Howard Vincent; supported by Mr. Samuel Roberts; to be read a second time upon Friday, 13th May, and to be printed. [Bill 172.]

Education (Scotland) Bill.—[SECOND READING].—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. Black (Banffshire) 128
The Lord Advocate (Mr. A. Graham Murray, Buteshire) 137
Mr. Thomas Shaw (Hawick Burghs) 142
Mr. Parker Smith (Lanarkshire, Partick) 153
Mr. Charles Douglas (Lanarkshire, N.W.) 159
Sir Charles Renshaw, Renfrewshire, W.) 166
Mr. Haldane (Haddingtonshire) 171
Sir John Tuke (Edinburgh and St. Andrews Universities) 176
Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.) 177
Mr. Maxwell (Dumfriesshire) 185

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the debate stood adjourned till this Evening's Sitting.

EVENING SITTING.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL—[SECOND READING].—Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on Question [2nd May], "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Question again proposed.

Mr. Maxwell 186
Mr. Crombie (Kincardineshire) 190
Sir Mark Stewart (Kirkcudbrightshire) 193
Mr. John Dewar (Inverness) 196
Mr. Claude Hay (Shoreditch, Hoxton) 200
Mr. Ure (Linlithgowshire) 202
Mr. A. Graham Murray 206

Motion made and Question proposed, " That the Debate be now adjourned." (*Mr. Weir.*)

Mr. A. Graham Murray rose in his place, and claimed to move, " That the Question be now put."

Question put, " That the Question be now put."

The House divided :—Ayes, 128 ; Noes, 72. (Division List No. 102.)

The House divided :—Ayes, 70 ; Noes, 127. (Division List No. 103.)

Question put accordingly, " That the Debate be now adjourned."

Mr. A. Graham Murray claimed, " That the original Question be now put."

Original Question, " That the Bill be now read a second time," put accordingly, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed for to-morrow.

Adjourned at twenty-two minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: TUESDAY, 3RD MAY, 1904.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The Lord Chancellor acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with :—

Mullingar, Kells, and Drogheda Railway.

And also the Certificates that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with :—

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 2) [H.L.] ; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3) [H.L.].

The same were ordered to lie on the Table 221

De Trafford Estate Bill [H.L.].—Judge's Report received ; Bill presented, and read 1ª). 221

Llanelly Harbour Bill [H.L.].—The King's consent signified ; and Bill reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments 221

May 3.] Page

Marylebone Chapels (St. James, Westmoreland Street) Bill [H.L.]; Blyth and Cowpen Gas Bill; Kirkby-in-Ashfield Urban District Gas Bill; Minehead Urban District Council Water Bill [H.L.]; Kettering Improvement Bill.—Reported, with Amendments 221

Sutton Gas Bill; Bishop's Stortford and District Gas Bill.—Reported, without Amendment 221

St. Mary Woolnoth Bill [H.L.].—Report from the Select Committee, That the Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the Bill, the opposition thereto having been withdrawn; read, and ordered to lie on the Table. The orders made on the 4th of March and the 22nd of April last discharged, and Bill committed 221

Amersham, Beaconsfield, and District Water Bill—Read 2ª, and committed 221

Chesterfield Gas and Water Board Bill [H.L.]; Harrogate Waterworks Tramroad Bill [H.L.]; Leeds Corporation (Waterworks) Railway Bill [H.L.]; Neath, Pontardawe, and Brynaman Railway Bill [H.L.].—Read 3ª, and passed, and sent to the Commons 221

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill.—Brought from the Commons; read 1ª; to be printed; and referred to the Examiners. (No. 69.) 222

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [H.L.] (No. 67).—A Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Tramways Act, 1870, relating to Bishop Auckland, Shildon, and Spennymoor Tramways, Dewsbury Corporation Trámways, East Ham Urban District Council Tramways, Ossett Corporation Tramway, Sunderland Corporation Tramway, and West Ham Corporation Tramways. And

Canal Rates and Charges (Regents Canal) Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.] (No. 68).—A Bill to confirm a Provisional Order made by the Board of Trade under the Railway and Canal Traffic Act, 1888, containing the schedule of maximum rates and charges applicable to the Regents Canal.

Were presented by the Lord Wolverton; read 1ª; to be printed; and referred to the Examiners 222

Barry Railway (Extension of Time, etc.) Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to 222

Private Legislation Procedure (Wales) Bill—Message from the Commons for leave for the Lord Balfour to attend to be examined as a witness before the Select Committee of that House. Leave given for his Lordship to attend if he think fit; and his Lordship (in his place) consenting thereto, a Message ordered to be sent to the Commons to acquaint them therewith 222

St. Bartholomew's Hospital Bill [H.L.].—The Lord Bishop of London (in his place) consented to the Bill 222

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [H.L.] (No. 66).—A Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Tramways Act, 1870, relating to Altrincham Urban District Council Tramways. Calverley Urban District Council Tramways, Crompton Urban District Council Tramways, Plymouth Corporation Tramways, Rochdale Corporation Tramway, Royton Urban District Council Tramways, and Wardle Urban District Council Tramway 222

Educational Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill [H.L.]. Read 2ª (according to order) 223

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS (MISCELLANEOUS SERIES).—No. 608. Germany (Special Schools for Ship Engineers) 223

AFRICA, No. 5 (1904).—Agricultural Report on the district between Voi and Kiu, in the East African Protectorate, by Mr. A. Linton, Director of Agriculture, East Africa Protectorate; and return of game shot in the Protectorate during 1903.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 223

IRISH LAND COMMISSION (RULES).—Rules made in pursuance of Section 88, Sub-section 5, of the Irish Land Act, 1903, dated 23rd April, 1904. Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table .. 223

Street Betting Bill [H.L.]—[SECOND READING.]—Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

Lord Davey 224

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Davey.*)

Lord Belper 229
The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury 230
Lord Newton 232
The Earl of Aberdeen 233

On Question, agreed to; Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Tuesday next.

LOADING-PORT CLAUSE IN SHIPS' ARTICLES.

Lord Muskerry 235
Lord Wolverton 235

House adjourned at a quarter past Five o'clock, to Thursday next, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: TUESDAY, 3RD MAY, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH.—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz.:—Lancashire Electric Power Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time 236

Barnet District Gas and Water Bill; Donegal Railway Bill. Read the third time, and passed 236

Doncaster Corporation Bill; Huddersfield Corporation Act, 1902 (Amendment) Bill [Lords]; Strabane, Raphoe, and Convoy Railway Bill; Surrey Commercial Dock Bill. As amended, considered; to be read the third time 236

London Port and Docks Bill (BY ORDER).—Second Reading deferred till Monday, 6th June 236

LIVERPOOL AND LONDON AND GLOBE INSURANCE COMPANY [STAMP DUTIES].—Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That in lieu of the Stamp Duties which would have been payable upon the deeds or assurances which, in case the Bill had not been passed into an Act, would have been required to pass to and vest in the Company certain property, there be charged a stamp duty of five pounds, and such duty shall be impressed upon the certificate to be given by the Registrar of Joint Stock Companies under the third Section hereof. —(*Mr. Caldwell*) 236

Resolution to be reported to-morrow.

RAILWAY BILLS (GROUP NO. 8).—Ordered, That Police Inspector E. Digby do attend the Committee on Group No. 8 of Railway Bills to-day, at Three of the clock 237

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.—That they have agreed to—

Norwich Water Bill, without Amendment.

Great Eastern Railway (Steamboats) Bill, with Amendments.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, " An Act to vary and amend the provisions of the South Staffordshire Mines Drainage Acts, 1891 and 1904; and for other purposes." [South Staffordshire Mines Drainage Bills [Lords].

May 3.] *Page*

And, also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to free Maidenhead Bridge from tolls, to enable the Corporation of Maidenhead to borrow money for discharging the mortgage debt on the bridge, for vesting the Bridge Estates in the Corporation; and for other purposes in connection therewith." [Maidenhead Bridge Bill [Lords] 237

South Staffordshire Mines Drainage Bill [LORDS]; Maidenhead Bridge Bill [Lords]. Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills 237

PETITIONS.

BISHOPRICS OF SOUTHWARK AND BIRMINGHAM BILL.—Petitions in favour; from Richmond; and Battersea (two); to lie upon the Table 237

COUNTY COURTS ACT, 1903.—Petition from the Association of Trade Protection Societies of the United Kingdom, for alteration of law; to lie upon the Table 237

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Aberd n, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 238

HOUSE-LETTING (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Partick, against; to lie upon the Table 238

LICENCES (RENEWAL).—Petitions against alteration of law; from Harrow Road; Maenclochog; Swinefleet; Sheffield; Ford; Brentwood; Uxbridge; S. H. Kearsey and others; Liverpool; Stepney (three); Moulton; Llandissilio; Ammanford; Argyle; London; Ratcliff; Waltham Abbey; Horsham (two); Folkestone; Heyford; Barrowford (two); Southsea; Nottingham; Maidstone; Chester le Street; and West Hendon; to lie upon the Table 238

LICENSING BILL.—Petitions against; from Manchester; Aberdeen (three); London (two); South Byker; Canning Town; Islington; Newbiggin; Alston; Barrington; Broomhill; Seghill; Hexham; Grangemouth; and Chelsea; to lie upon the Table 238

LICENSING BILL.—Petition from Whitehaven, in favour; to lie upon the Table 238

POLLING ARRANGEMENTS (PARLIAMENTARY BOROUGHS) BILL.—Petition from Westminster, against; to lie upon the Table 238

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.—Petition from Abingdon, in favour; to lie upon the Table 238

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

IRISH LAND COMMISSION (RULES).—Paper [presented 2nd May] to be printed. [No. 154] 238

AFRICA (No. 5, 1904).—Copy presented, of Agricultural Report on the District between Voi and Kiu in the East Africa Protectorate, by Mr. A. Linton, Director of Agriculture East Africa Protectorate; and Return of Game shot in the Protectorate during 1903 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 238

May 3.] Page

Licensing Bill. –Copy ordered, " of Statement as to the procedure followed by the Board of Inland Revenue in ascertaining the value of property for the purposes of Estate Duty."—(*Mr. Cochrane*) .. ..
Copy presented accordingly; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 155.] 239

Licensing Bill.—Copy ordered, " of Statement showing, for each county and county borough, the number of publicans' and beerhouse Licences, and, approximately, the maximum sum leviable under the Licensing Bill in each area."—(*Mr. Cochrane.*)

Copy presented accordingly; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 156.] 239

TAXES AND IMPOSTS.

Return ordered, "showing (1) the Rates of Duties, Taxes, or Imposts collected by Imperial Officers; (2) the Quantities or Amounts taxed; (3) the gross receipts derived from each Duty; and (4) the Net Receipts and Appropriations thereof in the year ending the 31st day of March, 1904; and (1) the aggregate Gross Receipts derived from all such Duties, Taxes, or Imposts, under the principal heads of Revenue; (2) the aggregate Net Receipts; (3) the Charges of Collection; and (4) the Produce, after deducting these Charges on each of the ten years ending the 31st day of March, 1904."

" And, Notes to show any changes in the Taxes, Duties, and Imposts consequent upon the acceptance of the Budget Proposals of 1904 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 303, of Session 1903)."—(*Mr. Goddard.*) 239

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

COMPENSATION FOR LICENCES.—Question, Mr. Bayley (Derbyshire, Chesterfield); Answer, Mr. Akers-Douglas 239

SUSPENSION OF OMNIBUS DRIVERS' AND CONDUCTORS' LICENCES.—Question, Mr. Lough (Islington, W.); Answer, Mr. Akers-Douglas 240

LICENCES REFUSED BY COMMITTEE OF QUARTER SESSIONS—RIGHT OF APPEAL.—Question, Sir John Dorington (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury); Answer, Mr. Akers-Douglas 240

COMPULSORY LICENCES FOR BRITISH PATENTS.—Question, Sir John Leng (Dundee); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 241

POSTAL CASH-ON-DELIVERY SYSTEM.—Question, Lord Willoughby de Eresby (Lincolnshire, Horncastle); Answer, Lord Stanley 241

NEW SCHOOL AT HAYWARD'S HEATH.—Question, Mr. J. F. Hope (Sheffield, Brightside); Answer, Sir William Anson 242

ATTENDANCE AT SCHOOL OF YOUNG CHILDREN LIVING AT A DISTANCE.—Question, Mr. Hunt (Shropshire, Ludlow); Answer, Sir William Anson 242

EDUCATION ACT—PART PAYMENT OF RATES.—Question, Sir Brampton Gurdon (Norfolk, N.); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 24

May 3.]

Page

MOTOR CAR ACT—REPORT OF DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE.—Question, Mr. Shepherd Cross (Bolton); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 243

COMPENSATION FOR DAMAGE BY EXPLOSIVES USED FOR NAVAL PRACTICE.—Question, Mr. Reginald Lucas (Portsmouth); Answer, Mr. Pretyman .. 243

VOLUNTEERS—COURTS OF INQUIRY.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 243

INDIAN ARMY—ORDERS FOR PRIVATE FIRMS FOR NEW BATTERIES.—Question, Mr. J. F. Hope; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 243

NEW RIFLE—INCREASED RECOIL.—Question, Mr. Hunt; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 244

ARMY MANŒUVRES IN ESSEX—ESSEX YEOMANRY.—Question, Sir Carne Rasch (Essex, Chelmsford); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 244

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

MANCHESTER VOLUNTEERS' CAMP ARRANGEMENTS.—Question, Mr. Schwann (Manchester, N.); Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.) 244

MILITARY WORKS IN IRELAND—EMPLOYMENT OF CIVILIAN ENGINEERS.—Question, Mr. Sullivan (Westmeath, S.); Answer, Mr. Arnold Forster .. 245

BRITISH SOUTH AFRICA COMPANY—JAMESON RAID.—Question, Mr. Pirie, Aberdeen, N.); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Lyttelton, Warwick and Leamington) 245

SEISTAN BOUNDARY COMMISSION.—Question, Mr. Schwann; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) 246

MACEDONIAN REFORM—EUROPEAN CONSULS AT MONASTIR.—Question, Mr. Trevelyan (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland); Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Earl Percy, Kensington, S.) 247

MACEDONIA.—Question, Mr. Hugh Law (Donegal, W.); Answer, Earl Percy .. 247

DEATH DUTIES—VALUATION OF LICENSED PROPERTY.—Question, Mr. Henry Hobhouse (Somersetshire, E.); Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) 248

THE TOBACCO DUTY.—Question, Mr. Lough (Islington, W.); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 248

RACING NEWS BY WIRELESS TELEGRAPHY.—Question, Mr. Montagu (Huntingdonshire, Huntingdon; Answer, The Postmaster-General (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton) 249

POST OFFICE WAGES COMMITTEE.—Question, Mr. Claude Hay (Shoreditch, Hoxton); Answer, Lord Stanley 249

SMALLPOX IN EAST LONDON.—Question, Sir Thomas Dewar (Tower Hamlets, St. George's); Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Walter Long, Bristol, S.) 249

May 3.] *Page*

RATS AND THE SPREAD OF PLAGUE.—Question, Sir Thomas Dewar ; Answer, Mr. Walter Long 250

DARTMOOR PRISON STAFF'S QUARTERS.—Question, Mr. Claude Hay ; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Akers-Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's 251

OFF-LICENCE HOLDERS AND THE LICENSING BILL.—Question, Mr. Samuel Young (Cavan, E.) ; Answer, Mr. Akers-Douglas 251

ROSCOMMON MAIDEN QUARTER SESSIONS.—Question, Mr. Hayden (Roscommon, S.) ; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) .. 252

IRISH EMIGRATION STATISTICS.—Question, Dr. Ambrose (Mayo, W.) ; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 253

IRISH TRAINING COLLEGES, FREE HOMES.—Question, Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.) ; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 253

FALEHORRIB AND GORNASATE WORKS.—Question, Mr. Hugh Law ; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 253

ROSSBEG (DONEGAL) LANDING PLACE.—Question, Mr. Hugh Law ; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 254

IRISH MOTOR CAR SERVICES.—Question, Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.) ; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 254

TARBET TOURIST STEAMERS—GOVERNMENT SUBSIDY.—Question, Mr. William Redmond ; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 254

COLCLOUGH ESTATE, WEXFORD.—Question, Mr. Ffrench (Wexford, S.) ; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 255

BALLYMAHON MAGISTERIAL BENCH.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell (Longford, N.) ; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 255

IRISH POOR LAW UNIONS AND MILITARY PATIENTS.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell ; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 256

IRISH LAND PURCHASE STATISTICS.—Questions, Mr. Ffrench and Mr. John Redmond ; Answers, Mr. Wyndham 256

IRISH EVICTED TENANTS.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell ; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 257

THE EDUCATION CODE AND THE IRISH LANGUAGE.—Question, Mr. Boland ; Answer, The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education (Sir William Anson, Oxford University) 257

THE IRISH DICTIONARY.—Question, Mr. Boland ; Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Victor Cavendish, Derbyshire, W.) 258

IRISH LOCAL LOANS—RATE OF INTEREST.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell ; Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 258

FEMALE SUPERVISORS IN THE DUBLIN POST OFFICE.—Question, Mr. Nannetti (Dublin, College Green) ; Answer, Lord Stanley 259

May 3.] Page

AMERICAN MAIL DELAYS AT QUEENSTOWN.—Questions, Mr. Nannetti and Captain Donelan (Cork Co., E.); Answers, Lord Stanley 259

IRISH SORTERS AND THE IRISH LANGUAGE.—Question, Mr. Boland; Answer, Lord Stanley 260

IRISH POSTMASTERS AND THE IRISH LANGUAGE.—Question, Mr. Boland; Answer, Lord Stanley 260

IRISH NORTHERN DISTRICT SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER'S STAFF.—Question, Mr. Nannetti; Answer, Lord Stanley 261

TEMPLETOWN POSTAL ARRANGEMENTS.—Question, Mr. Ffrench; Answer, Lord Stanley 261

BELTURBET POST OFFICE.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Lord Stanley 262

BALTIMORE POSTAL SERVICE.—Question, Mr. Gilhooly (Cork County, W.); Answer, Lord Stanley 262

LONGFORD POST OFFICE NIGHT WORK.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Lord Stanley 263

TRANSVAAL OPINION ON THE CHINESE LABOUR QUESTION.—Questions, Major Seely (Isle of Wight), Mr. Eugene Wason (Clackmannan and Kinross), and Mr. William Redmond; Answers, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 263

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS.—Question, Mr. Trevelyan; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 265

ROYAL COMMISSION ON ECCLESIASTICAL IRREGULARITIES.—Question, Mr. Brynmor-Jones (Swansea District); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 265

NAVAL PRIZES OF WAR.—Questions, Sir E. Durning Lawrence (Cornwall, Truro), and Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 266

ANGLO-FRENCH AGREEMENT.—Question, Mr. George Ormsby-Gore (Shropshire, Oswestry); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 266

RE-ELECTION ON ACCEPTANCE OF MINISTERIAL OFFICE.—Questions, Mr. Forde Ridley (Bethnal Green, S.W.), Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean), and Mr. William Redmond; Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 266

STANDING ORDERS.—Question, Mr. Bathurst (Gloucestershire, Cirencester); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 267

WELSH EDUCATION DEADLOCK.—Question, Captain Clive (Herefordshire, Ross); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 268

THE LICENSING BILL.—Question, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 268

THE ALIENS BILL.—Questions, Mr. Sydney Buxton (Tower Hamlets, Poplar), and Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman; Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 269

May 3.]

Page

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE.—Question, Mr. Fitzroy (Northamptonshire, S.); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 269

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—Question, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman; Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 270

Savings Banks Acts Amendment Bill.—Reported, with Amendments, from the Standing Committee on Trade, etc.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 157.]

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 157].

Bill, as amended (in the Standing Committee), to be taken into consideration upon Friday, 17th June, and to be printed. [Bill 174.] 270

Police Superannuation Bill.—Reported, with Amendments, from the Standing Committee on Trade, etc.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 158.]

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 158.]

Bill, as amended (in the Standing Committee), to be taken into consideration upon Monday next, and to be printed. Bill 173.] 270

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).—Mr. HALSEY reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Member from the Standing Committee on Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing) Shipping and Manufactures: Mr. Victor Cavendish; and had appointed in substitution: Sir John Barrington Simeon.

Report to lie upon the Table 271

STANDING ORDERS.—Resolutions reported from the Select Committee—

1. "That, in the case of the City of London(Central Criminal Court House), Petition for Bill, the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with. That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill."

2. "That, in the case of the Richard Jaeger's Patent Bill [Lords], the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with. That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill."

Resolutions agreed to 271

NEW BILL.

Sunday Trading (Scotland) Bill.—"For the regulation and control of Sunday Trading in Scotland." Presented by Mr. Cameron Corbett; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 175.] .. 272

May 3.] *Page*

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (WAYS AND MEANS).

Motion made, and Question put, "That the proceedings on the Reports of the Committee of Ways and Means, if under discussion at Twelve o'clock this night, be not interrupted under the Standing Order (Sittings of the House)."—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

The House divided :—Ayes, 240 ; Noes, 163. (Division List No. 104). .. 272

WAYS AND MEANS [19TH APRIL] REPORT.—Order read, for Further Consideration of Second Resolution.

CUSTOMS—TOBACCO.—"That the duties of Customs payable under Section 1 of the Finance Act, 1898, on manufactured tobacco shall, on and after the 20th day of April, 1904, be increased, in the case of cigars, by sixpence per pound, and in the case of cigarettes by one shilling per pound, and the duties payable under the same section on unmanufactured tobacco shall, on and after the same date, be increased, in the case of stripped tobacco, by three pence in the pound."

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution."

Mr. Robson (South Shields) 275
Mr. Parker Smith (Lanarkshire, Partick) 283
Sir Walter Foster (Derbyshire, Ilkeston) 287
Mr. McKenna (Monmouthshire, N.) 291
The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) 299
Lord Hugh Cecil (Greenwich) 308
Mr. Lough (Islington, W.) 311
Major Jameson (Clare, W.) 317
Mr. Ainsworth (Argyllshire) 318

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 250 ; Noes, 176. (Division List No. 105).

WAYS AND MEANS (26TH APRIL).—Resolutions reported.

Continuance of Additional Customs Duties on Tobacco, Beer, and Spirits.

1. "That the additional Customs duties on tobacco, beer, and spirits imposed by Sections 2, 3, 4, and 5, of The Finance Act, 1900 (including any increased duties imposed by Section 5 of that Act), shall continue to be charged until the 1st day of August, 1905."

Continuance of Additional Excise Duties on Beer and Spirits.

2. "That the additional Excise Duties on beer and spirits imposed by Sections 6 and 7 of the Finance Act, 1900, shall continue to be charged until the 1st day of August, 1905."

Amendment of Law.

3. "That it is expedient to amend the Law relating to the National Debt Customs, and Inland Revenue."

May 3.] *Page*

Resolutions read a second time.

First Resolution.

Mr. Dalziel (*Kirkcaldy Burghs*) 324

Amendment proposed—

"In line 1, to leave out the word 'tobacco.'"—(*Mr. Dalziel.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'tobacco' stand part of the said Resolution."

Mr. Flynn (*Cork County, W.*) 324
Mr. Whitley (*Halifax*) 324

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 254 ; Noes, 178. (Division List No. 106.)

Motion made and Question put, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution."

The House divided :—Ayes, 259 ; Noes, 173. (Division List No. 107.)

Second Resolution—

Mr. Broadhurst (*Leicester*) 333

Amendment proposed—

"In line 1, to leave out the words 'beer and.'"—(*Mr. Broadhurst.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'beer and' stand part of the said Resolution."

Mr. Labouchere (*Northampton*) 335
Mr. Whitley 335
Mr. Corrie Grant (*Warwickshire, Rugby*) 336
Mr. Courtenay Warner (*Staffordshire, Lichfield*) 336

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 236 ; Noes, 163. (Division List No. 108.)

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution."

And, it being after half-past Seven of the Clock, the debate stood adjourned till this Evening's Sitting.

EVENING SITTING.

WAYS AND MEANS [26TH APRIL] REPORT.—Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on Question [3rd May], "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the Second Resolution, 'That the additional Excise Duties on beer and spirits imposed by Sections 6 and 7 of the Finance Act, 1900, shall continue to be charged until the 1st day of August, 1905.'"

Question again proposed.

Mr. Flynn (*Cork Co., W.*) .. 341
Sir E. Durning-Lawrence (*Cornwall, Truro*) .. 342
Mr. Samuel Young (*Cavan, W.*) .. 343
Mr. Groves (*Salford, S.*) .. 343
Sir Frederick Banbury (*Camberwell, Peckham*) .. 344
Mr. J. F. Hope (*Sheffield, Brightside*) .. 344
Mr. Soares (*Devonshire, Barnstaple*) .. 347
Mr. Austen Chamberlain .. 348
Mr. Whitley .. 350
Mr. Pirie (*Aberdeen, N.*) .. 351

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 206 ; Noes, 146. (Division List No. 109.)

Third Resolution, "That it is expedient to amend the Law relating to the National Debt, Customs, and Inland Revenue," further considered :—

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution."

Mr. Dalziel .. 354
Mr. Whitley .. 355
Mr. Austen Chamberlain .. 356
Sir Henry Fowler (*Wolverhampton, E.*) .. 358
Mr. McCrae (*Edinburgh, E.*) .. 359
Mr. Gibson Bowles (*Lynn Regis*) .. 360
Sir John Leng (*Dundee*) .. 361
Sir James Joicey (*Durham, Chester-le-Street*) .. 361
Mr. Martin (*Worcestershire, Droitwich*) .. 362
Mr. Levy (*Leicestershire, Loughborough*) .. 362
Sir John Brunner (*Cheshire, Northwich*) .. 363
Mr. Herbert Samuel (*Yorkshire, Cleveland*) .. 363
Mr. Lough .. 364
Mr. Weir (*Ross and Cromarty*) .. 364
Mr. Ainsworth .. 365
Mr. John Redmond (*Waterford*) .. 365

Question put and agreed to.

Ordered, That it be a further Instruction to the Gentlemen appointed to bring in a Bill upon the Resolution reported from the Committee of Ways and Means on the 26th day of April last, and then agreed to by the House, that they do make provision therein pursuant to the said Resolution.—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

Finance Bill.

"To grant certain Duties of Customs and Inland Revenue, to alter other Duties, and to amend the Law relating to Customs and Inland Revenue and the National Debt, and to make other provisions for the financial arrangements of the year," presented, and read the first time ; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 176.]

Provisional Order (Marriages) Bill—[Second Reading].—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

The Under Secretary of State for the Home Department (*Mr. Cochrane, Ayrshire*) 367
Mr. Dalziel (*Kirkcaldy Burghs*) 367
Mr. Caldwell (*Lanarkshire, Mid.*) 367

And, it being Midnight, the debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed to-morrow.

Foreign Ships (Application of Statutory Requirements).

Motion made and Question proposed, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire to what extent the Statutory Requirements applying to British ships trading to and from ports in the United Kingdom should be made applicable to Foreign vessels trading to and from such ports." —(*Mr. Gerald Balfour.*)

And, it being after Midnight, and objection being taken to further Proceeding, the debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed to-morrow. 367

Adjourned at Four minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: WEDNESDAY, 4th MAY, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Victoria University of Manchester Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment 369

Chesterfield Corporation (Tramways and Improvements) Bill [Lords]; Preston and Blackburn Tramways Bill [Lords]. Read a second time, and committed 369

Liverpool and London and Globe Insurance Company [Stamp Duties]. Resolution reported—"That in lieu of the Stamp Duties which would have been payable upon the deeds or assurances which, in case the Bill had not been passed into an Act, would have been required to pass to and vest in the Company certain property, there be charged a stamp duty of five pounds, and such duty shall be impressed upon the certificate to be given by the Registrar of Joint Stock Companies under the third section hereof." Resolution agreed to.
Ordered, That it be an Instruction to the Committee on the Liverpool and London and Globe Insurance Company Bill [Lords] that they have power to make provision there in pursuant to the said Resolution.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*) 369

May 4.] *Page*

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 1).—Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board for Ireland relating to the Urban Districts of Blackrock, Clonmel, Dalkey, Killiney and Ballybrack, Kingstown, Nenagh, Pembroke, Rathmines and Rathgar, Templemore and Thurles, and the Counties of Dublin, Tipperary (North Riding), and Tipperary (South Riding); ordered to be brought in by Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland and Mr. Wyndham.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill.—"To confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board for Ireland relating to the Urban Districts of Blackrock, Clonmel, Dalkey, Killiney, and Ballybrack, Kingstown, Nenagh, Pembroke, Rathmines and Rathgar, Templemore, and Thurles, and the Counties of Dublin, Tipperary (North Riding), and Tipperary (South Riding)" presented, and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 177.] 369

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 2).—Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board for Ireland relating to the Bangor and Newtownards and the County of Cork United Districts and the Ports of New Ross and Waterford; ordered to be brought in by Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland and Mr. Wyndham.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill.—"To confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board for Ireland relating to the Bangor and Newtownards and the County of Cork United Districts and the Ports of New Ross and Waterford," presented, and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 178.] 370

EDUCATION BOARD PROVISIONAL ORDERS (CARDIFF AND NEWPORT (MONMOUTHSHIRE) (BY ORDER).—Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Education, under Sections 17 (7) and 21 of The Education Act, 1902, relating to the county boroughs of Cardiff and Newport (Monmouthshire); ordered to be brought in by Sir William Anson and Mr. Victor Cavendish.

Education Board Provisional Orders (Cardiff and Newport (Monmouthshire) Bill.—"To confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Education, under Sections 17 (7) and 21 of The Education Act, 1902, relating to the county boroughs of Cardiff and Newport (Monmouthshire);" presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 179.] .. 370

PETITIONS.

DATYE, VAMAN, VISHNU.—Petition of Vaman Vishnu Datye, for redress of grievances; to lie upon the Table 371

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petitions for alteration; from Sutherland; and Comrie; to lie upon the Table 371

May 4.] Page

LICENCES (RENEWAL).—Petitions against alteration of law; from Hetton le Hole (two); Kilgerran; Leicester; North Lancashire; Murton; Sunbury; Port Isaac; Saltney Ferry (two); North Pembroke and South Cardigan; Henry's Moat; Saundersfoot; Nottingham; Stockton on Tees; Grangetown; Ilkeston; Stalybridge; Brymberian and Velindre; Houghton le Spring; Calver; Sheffield; Burslem; Lewes; Lynton; Walton; Leeds; Boncath; Silvertown; Woolwich; Preston; Rawtenstall; Chorley; Haslingden; Belper; Barrowford (two); Nelson; Ilfracombe; and Bideford; to lie upon the Table 371

LICENSING BILL.—Petitions against; from Mile End; Aberdeen; Eccles; East Ham (two); Grimsby; Forest Hill; Llanhilleth; Cramlington; Seaton Delaval (two); Dundee; Carlisle; Mickley; Greenhead; Jesmond; North Seaton; Prudhoe; Haltwhistle; Farnworth; New York; Wylam; Widdrington; Harley; Newmarket; Leicester; and Chiswick; to lie upon the Table 371

MERCHANDISE MARKS BILL.—Petition of the Scottish Trade Protection Society, against; to lie upon the Table 371

RE-VACCINATION BILL.—Petition from Westminster, in favour; to lie upon the Table 371

SALE OF BUTTER BILL.—Petition of the Scottish Trade Protection Society, in favour; to lie upon the Table 371

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

ANKYLOSTOMIASIS.—Copy presented, of Report to the Secretary of State for the Home Department, by A. E. Boycott, esquire, M.B., B.Sc. on the diagnosis of Ankylostoma infection, with special reference to the examination of the Blood [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 371

NATIONAL DEBT.—Copy presented, of Return showing (1) the Aggregate Gross Liabilities of the State as represented by the Nominal Funded Debt, Estimated Capital Liability in respect of Terminable Annuities, Unfunded Debt, and other Liabilities in respect of Debt, the Estimated Assets, and the Exchequer Balances, at the close of each financial year from 1835–6 to 1903–4, both inclusive; and (2) the Gross and Net Expenditure, charged annually during that period, against the Public Revenue, on account of the National Debt, and other payments connected with Capital Liabilities (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper [C. 1581] of Session 1903) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 372

PUBLIC WORKS (IRELAND).—Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 26th April, 1904, authorising the sale of a portion of foreshore near the old harbour of Dunleary, not required for the purposes of Kingstown Harbour [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 373

SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1884.—Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 29th April, 1904, declaring that George Hadfield, Fitter Marker-out, Royal Carriage Department, War Office, was appointed without a Civil Service Certificate through inadvertence on the part of the Head of his Department by Act]; to lie upon the Table 372

May 4.] *Page*

RAILWAY ACCIDENTS.—Copy presented, of Returns of Accidents and Casualties as reported to the Board of Trade by the several Railway Companies in the United Kingdom during the year ended 31st December, 1903, together with reports of the Inspecting Officers of the Railway Department to the Board of Trade, upon certain Accidents which were inquired into [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 372

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

POST OFFICE NIGHT MESSENGERS IN SCOTLAND.—Question, Mr. Leveson-Gower (Sutherland); Answer, Lord Stanley 373

POSTAL CASH-ON-DELIVERY SYSTEM.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid.); Answer, Lord Stanley 373

OPENING OF ROAD FROM DUKE OF YORK'S STEPS TO CHARING CROSS.—Question, Sir Henry Fowler (Wolverhampton, E.); Answer, Lord Balcarres 373

PRECAUTIONS AGAINST FIRE IN INSTITUTIONS UNDER GOVERNMENT CONTROL.—Question, Mr. H. C. Richards (Finsbury, E.); Answer, Mr. Akers-Douglas 373

LEGAL EXPENSES OF ECCLESIASTICAL COMMISSIONERS.—Question, Mr. Humphreys Owen (Montgomeryshire); Answer, Mr. Akers-Douglas 374

PUBLICATION OF VIVISECTION RETURNS.—Question, Dr. Shipman (Northampton); Answer, Mr. Akers-Douglas 375

REGISTRATION MARKS ON MOTOR CARS.—Question, Mr. Brigg (Yorkshire, W.R., Keighley); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 375

NAVAL SPEED TRIALS ON THE CORNISH COAST—DAMAGE TO FISHERIES.—Question, Sir Lewis Molesworth (Cornwall, Bodmin); Answer, Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes 376

LOCAL LOANS UNDER THE PUBLIC LOANS ACT.—Question, Mr. Brigg; Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 376

EXTENSION OF THE EDUCATION (LOCAL AUTHORITY DEFAULT) BILL TO SECONDARY SCHOOLS.—Question, Mr. Brigg; Answer, Sir William Anson 377

ISSUE OF REMAINDER OF TRANSVAAL GUARANTEED LOAN.—Question, Sir Edgar Vincent (Exeter); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 377

ANNUAL RETURN OF NATIONAL DEBT.—Question, Mr. Buchanan (Perthshire, E.); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 377

ARMY CANDIDATES—LEAVING AND QUALIFYING CERTIFICATES.—Question, Sir Carne Rasch; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 377

OUTPUT OF GOLD IN THE TRANSVAAL—KAFFIRS EMPLOYED.—Question, Mr. Sydney Buxton (Tower Hamlets, Poplar); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 378

IMMIGRATION REGULATIONS IN BRITISH COLONIES.—Question, Mr. Brigg; Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 380

FLOGGING IN THE NAVY.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.); Answer, Mr. Pretyman 380

May 4.] Page

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

NAVAL PAYMASTERS-IN-CHIEF.—Question, Mr. Skewes-Cox (Surrey, Kingston); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Pretyman, Suffolk, Woodridge) 380

DUKE OF NORFOLK'S COMMISSION ON MILITIA AND VOLUNTEERS.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.) 381

REPORTED DISTURBANCES IN BRITISH NEW GUINEA.—Question, The Master of Elibank (Edinburgh, Midlothian); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Lyttelton, Warwick and Leamington) 381

THE TIBETAN MISSION.—Question, Mr. Lambert (Devonshire, South Molton); Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) 382

MACEDONIAN GENDAMERIE.—Question, Mr. Charles Allen (Gloucestershire, Stroud); Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Earl Percy, Kensington, S.) 382

SOMALILAND—THE MIJERTAIN TRIBE.—Question, Mr. Lambert; Answer, Earl Percy 383

DEATH DUTIES ON LICENSED PROPERTY.—Question, Mr. Lambert; Answer, the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) 383

PUBLICANS' LICENCES.—Question, Mr. Edmund Roberston (Dundee); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Akers-Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's) 384

PADDINGTON BUTCHERS AND THE SANITARY INSPECTOR.—Question, Mr. Field (Dublin, St. Patrick); Answer, the President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Walter Long, Bristol, S.) 384

ALIENS IN RECEIPT OF POOR LAW RELIEF.—Question, Mr. Herbert Samuel (Yorkshire, Cleveland); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 385

CANADIAN CATTLE.—Question, Captain Ellice (St. Andrew's Burghs); Answer, Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes (Huntingdonshire, Ramsay) 385

SALE OF TUBERCULAR CATTLE FOR BREEDING PURPOSES.—Question, Captain Ellice; Answer, Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes 386

RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS.—Question, Mr. Humphreys Owen (Montgomeryshire); Answer, The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education (Sir William Anson, Oxford University) 386

ABUSIVE SOLDIER AT LONGFORD.—Questions, Mr. J. P. Farrell (Longford, N.) and Mr. John Redmond (Waterford); Answers, The Attorney-General for Ireland (Mr. Atkinson, Londonderry, N.) 387

CUSACK ESTATE, COUNTY LONGFORD.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, the Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 388

May 4.] *Page*

IRISH EXHIBITS AT THE ST. LOUIS EXHIBITION.—Question, Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 388

TUAM NURSES' SALARY.—Question, Mr. Reddy (King's County, Birr); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 389

TRINITY COLLEGE LANDS.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 389

IRISH FISHING PIERS.—Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde (Wexford, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 390

IRISH TECHNICAL SCHOOLS.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. Wyndham .. 390

GALLOWAY BULLS FOR IRELAND.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 390

ROWE ESTATE, WEXFORD.—Questions, Mr. Ffrench (Wexford, S.) and Mr. T. W. Russell (Tyrone, S.); Answers, Mr. Wyndham 391

AVONDALE ESTATE, WICKLOW.—Question, Mr. James O'Connor (Wicklow, W.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 391

LABOURERS' COTTAGES SCHEMES.—Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy (Limerick, W.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 392

THE LABOURERS (IRELAND) BILL.—Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 392

COSTS ATTENDANT ON LABOURERS' COTTAGE SCHEMES.—Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 392

AGRARIAN OFFENCES IN IRELAND.—Question, Mr. Flynn (Cork, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 393

GALBRAITH ESTATE, COUNTY TYRONE.—Questions, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answers, Mr. Wyndham 393

LONGFORD POLICE CELLS.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 394

MUNSTER DAIRY SCHOOL.—Question, Mr. Flynn; Answer, Mr. Wyndham .. 394

DUBLIN COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND ART—ARCHITECT, NATIONALITY.—Questions, Mr. Field, Mr. Mooney (Dublin Co., S.), Mr. John Redmond, and Mr. Lonsdale; Answers, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Victor Cavendish, Derbyshire, W.) 395

SALE OF BUTTER BILL.—Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy; Answer, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 396

THE PORT OF LONDON BILL.—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 396

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—Questions, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs), and Mr. Lonsdale; Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 397

PUBLIC PETITIONS COMMITTEE.—Fifth Report brought up and read; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

May 4.] Page

Bishoprics of Southwark and Birmingham Bill—[SECOND READING.]—Order for Second Reading read.

The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (*Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.*) 397

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. Charles McArthur (*Liverpool, Exchange*) 402
Mr. Brynmor Jones (*Swansea District*) 407

Amendment proposed—

" To leave out from the word ' That ' to the end of the Question, in order to add the words ' in view of the continuance in the Established Church of England and Wales of grave and widespread disorders which the Archbishops and Bishops have failed to restrain, this House declines to assent to any revival of the provisions of the Bishoprics Act, 1878, until satisfactory assurances are obtained that the Archbishops and Bishops will enforce a reasonable conformity by the clergy to the Book of Common Prayer, the Articles of Religion, and the law as determined by the Courts which have statutory jurisdiction in matters ecclesiastical,'—(*Mr. Charles McArthur*)—instead thereof."

Question proposed, " That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. J. Chamberlain (*Birmingham, W.*) 412
Mr. Newdigate (*Warwickshire, Nuneaton*) 415
Mr. Austin Taylor (*Liverpool, East Toxteth*) 417
Mr. Lowe (*Birmingham, Edgbaston*) 421
Mr. Emmott (*Oldham*) 423
Mr. Kimber (*Wandsworth*) 425
Mr. Griffith Boscawen 426
Mr. Griffith Boscawen (*Kent, Tunbridge*) 426
Colonel Sandys (*Lancashire, Bootle*) 428
Mr. Seely (*Lincoln*) 429
Mr. Ellis Griffith (*Anglesey*) 431
Mr. Martin (*Worcestershire, Droitwich*) 432
Mr. O'Mara (*Kilkenny, S.*) 433
Mr. Middlemore (*Birmingham, N.*) 433
Sir John Gorst (*Cambridge University*) 435

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 279 ; Noes, 97. (Division List No. 110.)

Main Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 282 ; Noes, 85. (Division List No. 111.)

Bill read a second time.

Motion made and Question proposed, " That the Bill be committed to the Standing Committee on Law, etc."—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

Page
Mr. Dalziel (Kirkcaldy Burghs) 445
Mr. T. W. Russell (Tyrone, S.) 445
Mr. Whitley (Halifax) 445
Mr. Samuel Evans (Glamorganshire, Mid.) 446
Mr. Lloyd George (Carnarvon Burghs) 446
Mr. A. J. Balfour 447
Mr. John Redmond (Waterford) 449
Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis) 449
Mr. Ellis Griffith 450
Mr. Flynn (Cork Co., N.) 451

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place, and claimed to move that the Question be now put.

Question put " That the question be now put."

The House divided :—Ayes, 242 ; Noes, 120. (Division List No. 112.)

Question put accordingly.

The House divided :—Ayes, 236 ; Noes, 120. (Division List No. 113.)

Bill committed to the Standing Committee on Law, etc.

FOREIGN SHIPS (APPLICATION OF STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS).—Order read for resuming adjourned debate on Question [3rd May], "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire to what extent the statutory requirements applying to British ships trading to and from ports in the United Kingdom should be made applicable to foreign vessels trading to and from such ports."—(*Mr. Gerald Balfour.*)

Question again proposed.

Mr. Caldwell (Lanarkshire, Mid) 459
Mr. O'Mara (Kilkenny, S.) 460

Question put, and agreed to.

Ordered, That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire to what extent the Statutory Requirements applying to British ships trading to and from ports in the United Kingdom should be made applicable to Foreign vessels trading to and from such ports.

EVENING SITTING.

CRIMINAL LAW AND PROCEDURE (IRELAND) ACT, 1887.

Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.) 460
Mr. Haviland Burke (King's County, Tullamore) 463

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That, in the opinion of this House, the presence of the Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act on the Statute-book is a gross violation of the Constitution, without parallel in any other portion of His Majesty's dominions, and that the Act should be immediately repealed."—(*Mr. Boland.*)

May 5.] *Page*

Mr. Wm. Moore (*Antrim, N.*) 467
Mr. Joseph Devlin (*Kilkenny, N.*) 470
Colonel Saunderson (*Armagh, N.*) 472
Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (*Stirling Burghs*) 475
The Chief Secretary for Ireland (*Mr. Wyndham, Dover*) 478
Mr. John Redmond 484
Mr. T. W. Russell (*Tyrone, S.*) 488

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 124 ; Noes, 197. (Division List No. 114.)

Adjourned at thirteen minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: THURSDAY, 5TH MAY, 1904.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with :—

Baker Street and Waterloo Railway.

The same was ordered to lie upon the Table. 493

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE.—Report from, That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the City of London (Central Criminal Court House) Bill ought to be dispensed with.

Read and agreed to 493

Metropolitan District Railway Bill [H.L.].—The King's consent signified ; and Bill reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments 493

Great Yarmouth Corporation Bill [H.L.].—The King's consent signified ; and Bill reported, with Amendments 493

Preston Corporation Water Bill [H.L.] ; Whitby Gas Bill ; Bournemouth Corporation (Tramways) Bill [H.L.] ; Leicestershire and Warwickshire Electric Power Bill [H.L.] ; Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Electric Power Bill [H.L.] ; Cardiff Railway Bill [H.L.].
Reported with Amendments. 493

Ryde Gas Bill.—Reported, with an Amendment 493

Newcastle and Gateshead Water Bill [H.L.].—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments 493

Alexandra (Newport and South Wales) Docks and Railway Bill [H.L.].—Report from the Select Committee, That the Bill on being reported should be referred to the Chairman of Committees in order that certain proofs and consents may be given in respect thereof ; read, and agreed to. Bill reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments, and re-committed 493

Clyde Valley Electrical Power Bill [H.L.].—Read 3^a, and passed, and sent to the Commons 493

Wellington (Somerset) Gas Bill.—Read 3^a, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons 494

Barnet District Gas and Water Bill; Donegal Railway Bill. Brought from the Commons; read 1^a; and referred to the Examiners 494

Victoria University of Manchester Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to 494

Hutchesons' Hospital and Hutchesons' Educational Trust Bill [H.L.]; South Shields Gas Bill; Chippenham Gas Bill; Sheppey Gas Bill; North Staffordshire Railway Bill; London, Tilbury, and Southend Railway Bill. Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Lord Aberdare be proposed to the House as a Member of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Earl of Lathom; read, and agreed to 494

Metropolitan Common Scheme (Hillingdon East) Provisional Order Bill; Metropolitan Common Scheme (Farnborough) Provisional Order Bill. Read 2^a (according to order), and committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow 494

PETITIONS.

Weights and Measures (Metric System) Bill [H.L.].—Petitions in favour of; of West Ham Corporation; Edinburgh Parish Council; read, and ordered to lie on the Table 494

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Journal Committee.—Report from, That the One hundred and thirty-fifth Volume of the Journals (3rd Edward VII., 1903), with an Index, was ready for delivery; read, and ordered to lie on the Table; and the said Volume ordered to be delivered in the same manner as the preceding Volumes of the Journals have been delivered 494

Trade Reports (Annual Series).

No. 3151. China (Hankow).

No. 3152. Spain (Bilbao). 494

Ankylostomiasis.—Report to the Secretary of State for the Home Department, by A. E. Boycott, Esq., M.B., B.Sc., on the diagnosis of ankylostoma infection, with special reference to the examination of the blood 495

Motor Cars.—Report of the Departmental Committee appointed by the President of the Local Government Board to inquire with regard to regulations for the purposes of Section 12 of the Motor Car Act, 1903, together with Minutes of Evidence taken before the Committee.

Part I. Report.

Part II. Minutes of Evidence, Appendix, and Index to Evidence .. 495

May 5.] Page

RAILWAY ACCIDENTS.—Returns of accidents and casualties as reported to the Board of Trade by the several railway companies in the United Kingdom during the year ended 31st December, 1903, in pursuance of the Regulation of Railways Act (1871); together with reports of the inspecting officers, assistant inspecting officers, and sub-inspectors of the Railway Department to the Board of Trade upon certain accidents which were inquired into. Part II. Reports on Accidents 495

FISHERIES (SCOTLAND).—Twenty-second Annual Report of the Fishery Board for Scotland, being for the year 1903. Part I. General Report.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie upon the Table 495

SUPERANNUATION.—Treasury minute, dated 29th April, 1904, declaring that George Hadfield, fitter, marker-out, Royal Carriage Department, War Office, was appointed without a Civil Service certificate through inadvertence on the part of the head of his Department 495

PUBLIC WORKS (IRELAND).—Treasury Minute, dated 26th April, 1904, authorising the sale of a portion of foreshore near the old harbour of Dunleary, not required for the purposes of Kingstown Harbour.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table .. 495

Weights and Measures (Metric System) Bill [H.L.].—Report from the Select Committee (with the Proceedings of the Committee and Appendix) made, and to be printed. (No. 70.). Minutes of Evidence laid upon the Table and to be delivered out. Bill reported with Amendments and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Friday the 13th instant; and to be printed as amended. (No. 71) 496

Sale of Intoxicants to Children Bill [H.L.].—Read 3ª (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons 496

Outdoor Relief (Friendly Societies) Bill [H.L.]

The Lord Chancellor (*The Earl of Halsbury*) 496
Lord Monkswell 496
Earl Spencer 498

Order of the day for the Third Reading read.

Moved, That the debate stand adjourned.—(*Lord Monkswell.*)

On Question, Motion agreed to.

Open Spaces Bill [H.L.]—[SECOND READING.]—Order for the day for the Second Reading read.

The President of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries (*The Earl of Onslow* 499

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2 ."—(*The Earl of Onslow.*)

On Question, Motion agreed to.

Read 2ª (according to order), and committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

MACEDONIA.

Earl Spencer 499
Lord Newton 503
The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs) The Marquess of Lansdowne) 508
Lord Tweedmouth 513

House adjourned at a quarter before Six o'clock till To-morrow, half past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: THURSDAY, 5TH MAY, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Hampton-in-Arden Gas Bill.—Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to 515

Ipswich Dock Commission Bill [LORDS] (King's Consent signified).—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 515

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill. Read the third time, and passed 515

City of London (Central Criminal Court House) Bill.—" To authorise the raising by borrowing of money for the provision and erection of premises for the Sessions of the Central Criminal Court," presented and read the first time; to be read a second time 515

LAND DRAINAGE PROVISIONAL ORDER.—Bill to confirm a Provisional Order under the Land Drainage Act, 1861, relating to lands in the parishes of Owston and West Butterwick, in the county of Lincoln (Parts of Lindsey), ordered to be brought in by Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes and Mr. Victor Cavendish.

Land Drainage Provisional Order Bill.—" To confirm a Provisional Order under The Land Drainage Act, 1861, relating to lands in the parishes of Owston and West Butterwick, in the county of Lincoln (Parts of Lindsey)," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills and to be printed. [Bill 180] .. 515

London United Tramways Bill.—Reported with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 515

RAILWAY BILLS (GROUP NO. 8). Mr. HOBHOUSE reported from the Committee of Group No. 8 of Railway Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, they had adjourned till Tuesday next, at half-past Eleven of the Clock.

Report to lie upon the Table 515

London and India Docks Company Bill.—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 515

May 5.] *Page*

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.—That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to provide against the destruction of undersized flat-fish." [Sea Fisheries Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to authorise the Chesterfield Gas and Water Board to make new waterworks and extend their gas works; and for other purposes." [Chesterfield Gas and Water Board Bill [Lords].

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to empower the Corporation of Harrogate to construct a temporary tramroad, telephonic communication, and other works in connection with their waterworks; and for other purposes." [Harrogate Waterworks Tramroad Bill [Lords].

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act for empowering the Corporation of Leeds to construct certain temporary railways and works to facilitate the construction of their authorised waterworks in the Valley of the Burn, and to authorise the placing of electric lines in certain highways; and for other purposes." [Leeds Corporation (Waterworks) Railway) Bill [Lords].

And, also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confer further powers upon the Neath, Pontardawe, and Brynaman Railway Company for the construction of Railways and the raising of capital, and for other purposes." [Neath, Pontardawe, and Brynaman Railway Bill [Lords] 516

Private Legislation Procedure (Wales) Bill.—That they give leave to the Lord Balfour of Burleigh to attend to be examined as a Witness before the Select Committee on the Private Legislation Procedure (Wales) Bill .. 517

Chesterfield Gas and Water Board Bill [LORDS].—Harrogate Waterworks Tramroad Bill [Lords]; Leeds Corporation (Waterworks) Railway Bill [Lords]; Neath, Pontardawe, and Brynaman Railway Bill [Lords]. Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills 517

PETITIONS.

BISHOPRICS OF SOUTHWARK AND BIRMINGHAM BILL.—Petitions from Lavender Hill, in favour; to lie upon the Table 517

EDUCATION ACT, 1902.—Petition from Hull, for alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table 517

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Dunkeld, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 517

LICENCES (RENEWAL).—Petitions against alteration of Law; from Baildon, Wardoun; Liverpool; Llandrindod Wells; Moss Side; Llanidloes (four); Upper Parkstone; Oldham; East Yorkshire; Newtownards; Greenwich; Hindley; Lincoln's Inn Fields; Kilburn; Cheshunt; Walthamstow; Nuneaton; Acocks Green; Holborn; Talenfoel; Shaftesbury Avenue; Manchester; Street; Thornley; Leicester; Sileby; Windsor; and Little Dean; to lie upon the Table 517

LICENSING BILL.—Petitions against; from Stourbridge; Leominster (two); West Sleekburn; Bradford and Halifax; Lower Wortley; Morpeth; Lavender Hill; Higher Openshaw; Croydon; Wakefield; Glossop; Halstead; Westerhope; Twickenham; Scotswood; Shiremoor; Woodside (four); Falkirk; Sheffield; Forest Hall; Wensleydale; Market Harborough; Shankhouse; Amble; West Cramlington; Carlisle; Chelsea; Elgin; Newcastle; Nenthead; Pegswood; and Bishop Auckland; to lie upon the Table 517

May 5.] *Page*

LICENSING BILL.—Petition from Edinburgh, for extension of provisions to Scotland; to lie upon the Table 518

LOCAL AUTHORITIES (TAXATION AND PURCHASE OF LAND) BILL.—Petition from Hackney, in favour; to lie upon the Table 518

RE-VACCINATION BILL.—Petitions in favour; from Stockport; and Holborn; to lie upon the Table 518

TRADES UNIONS AND TRADE DISPUTES BILL.—Petition from the Scottish Trade Protection Society, against; to lie upon the Table 518

TRADES UNIONS AND TRADE DISPUTES (No. 2) BILL.—Petition from the Scottish Trade Protection Society, against; to lie upon the Table 518

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

MALTA.—Copy presented, of Further Correspondence relating to the Political Condition of Malta [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 518

VICTORIA (THE ELECTORAL DISTRICTS BOUNDARIES ACT, 1903).—Copy presented of the Electoral Districts Boundaries Act, 1903 (Victoria) No. 1895 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 159.] 518

VICTORIA (THE ELECTORAL PROVINCES BOUNDARIES ACT, 1903).—Copy presented, of The Electoral Provinces Boundaries Act, 1903 (Victoria) No. 1896 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 160.] 518

FISHERY BOARD (SCOTLAND).—Copy presented, of Twenty-Second Annual Report of the Fishery Board for Scotland, being for the year 1903. Part I., General Report [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 519

MOTOR CARS (DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE).—Copy presented, of Report of the Departmental Committee appointed by the President of the Local Government Board to inquire with regard to regulations for the purposes of Section 12 of The Motor Car Act, 1903. Part I. Report [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 519

MOTOR CARS (DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE).—Copy presented, of Report of the Departmental Committee appointed by the President of the Local Government Board to inquire with regard to regulations for the purposes of Section 12 of The Motor Car Act, 1903. Part II. Minutes of Evidence, Appendix, and Index to Evidence [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 519

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3151 and 3152 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 519

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.—Temporary Laws. Register of Temporary Laws for the Fifth Session, Twenty-seventh Parliament, of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, pursuant to Report of the Select Committee on Expiring Laws in Session 1866; to be printed [No. 161.] 519

May 5.] Page

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

IMPROVED POSTAL ARRANGEMENTS AT CASTLETOWN BEREHAVEN.—Question, Mr. Gilhooly (Cork Co., W.); Answer, Lord Stanley 519

MOY (COUNTY TYRONE) MORNING MAIL.—Question, Mr. T. W. Russell (Tyrone, S.); Answer, Lord Stanley 520

NATIONAL TELEPHONE COMPANY'S CHARGES AT TUNBRIDGE WELLS.—Question, Mr. Griffith Boscawen (Kent, Tonbridge); Answer, Lord Stanley 520

HARBOURS OF REFUGE—CAPTAIN FREDERICK'S REPORT. — Question, Mr. Soares (Devonshire, Barnstaple); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 521

LEYS CHARITY—REPRESENTATION OF PARISH OF COOMBE MARTIN.—Question, Mr. Soares; Answer, Mr. Griffith Boscawen 251

FEES AND SALARIES OF ENGLISH AND IRISH LAY OFFICERS.—Question, Mr. Whitley (Halifax); Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 522

REORGANISATION OF THE CUSTOMS SERVICE.—Question, Mr. Ernest Gray (West Ham, N.); Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 523

METROPOLITAN ASYLUMS BOARD AND VIVISECTION.—Question, Dr. Shipman (Northampton); Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 523

AGGREGATE ANNUAL VALUE OF LICENSED PREMISES.—Question, Mr. Henry Hobhouse (Somersetshire, E.); Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 523

REGISTRATION OF TEACHERS OF MUSIC.—Question, Mr. Agg-Gardner (Cheltenham); Answer, Sir William Anson 524

CONSTRUCTION OF HARBOUR AT AVOCH, ROSS-SHIRE—GOVERNMENT GRANT.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 525

CUSTOMS AND EXCISE DUTIES.—Question, Mr. Herbert Samuel (Yorkshire, Cleveland); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 526

VALUATION OF LICENSED PREMISES FOR ESTATE DUTY.—Question, Mr. Henry Hobhouse; Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 527

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA AND COOLIE LABOUR.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 529

GOVERNMENT CULTIVATION OF RUBBER IN BURMA.—Question, Mr. Griffith Boscawen; Answer, Mr. Brodrick 529

SIR JOHN STEWART'S ESTATE, COUNTY TYRONE.—Question, Mr. Murnaghan (Tyrone, Mid.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 530

COMPENSATION FOR INJURIES BY THE POLICE—CASE OF MR. W. M'GIFFORD OF HILLSBOROUGH.—Question, Mr. Seymour Ormsby-Gore (Lincolnshire, Gainsborough); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 530

FOREIGN SPIRIT SOLD AS IRISH WHISKY.—Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde (Wexford, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 531

May 5.] *Page*

APPOINTMENT OF DR. KIRWAN AT BALLINASLOE LUNATIC ASYLUM.—Question, Mr. Roche (Galway, E.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 531

APPLICATION FOR RE-INSTATEMENT FROM EVICTED TENANTS IN COUNTY WATERFORD.—Question, Mr. Power (Waterford, E.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham .. 531

DUNMANWAY ELECTORAL DIVISION.—Question, Mr. Edward Barry (Cork Co., S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 532

VETERINARY OFFICERS—COMPULSORY RESIDENCE IN THEIR DISTRICTS.—Question, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 532

SOUTH AFRICA—REPATRIATION OF NATIVES.—Question, Mr. Hunter Craig (Lanarkshire, Govan); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 532

WAGES OF CHINESE COOLIES IN TRANSVAAL MINES.—Question, Mr. Whitley; Answer, Mr. Lyttleton 533

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

MILITARY DRAFTS FOR INDIA.—Question, Captain Norton (Newington, W.); Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.)

WOOLWICH ARSENAL—PAYMENT OF BONUSES TO SUSPENDED WORKMEN.—Questions, Captain Norton; Answers, Mr. Arnold-Forster 534

INDIAN COMPETITIVE EXAMINATIONS FOR THE PUBLIC SERVICE.—Question, Colonel Nolan (Galway, N.); Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) 535

LICENSING BILL—COMPENSATION PROVISIONS.—Question, Mr. Corbett (Glasgow, Tradeston); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Akers Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's) 535

THE PURCHASE OF CHILIAN WARSHIPS.—Question, Mr. Edmund Robertson (Dundee); Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) 536

UNREGISTERED FRIENDLY SOCIETIES AND INCOME TAX.—Question, Mr. George Whiteley (Yorkshire, W.R., Pudsey); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain .. 536

NORTH SEA FISHERIES.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Victor Cavendish, Derbyshire, W.) 537

HISTORICAL WELSH MANUSCRIPTS.—Question, Mr. Alfred Davis (Carmarthen Boroughs); Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 538

WELSH NONCONFORMIST CHILDREN IN CHURCH SCHOOLS.—Questions, Mr. Alfred Davies (Carmarthen Boroughs); Answers, The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education (Sir William Anson, Oxford University) 538

NATIONAL EDUCATIONAL COUNCIL.—Question, Mr. George Kenyon (Denbigh Boroughs): Answer, Sir William Anson 539

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Question, Mr. Crombie (Kincardineshire); Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. Graham Murray, Buteshire) 539

May 5.] *Page*

IRISH FISHERMEN'S INSURANCE SCHEME.—Question, Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 539

COOSCROUM LANDING PLACE.—Question, Mr. Boland; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 540

LOCAL GOVERNMENT SURCHARGES IN TIPPERARY.—Question, Mr. Cullinan (Tipperary, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 540

EDGE ESTATE, QUEEN'S COUNTY.—Question, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 541

ESTATES COMMISSIONERS' RULES.—Question, Mr. P. A. McHugh (Leitrim, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 541

ARMAGH WORKHOUSE MASTER'S SALARY.—Question, Mr. John Campbell (Armagh, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 542

WESTMEATH QUARTER SESSIONS.—Question, Mr. Sullivan (Westmeath, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 543

ROCKFIELD ESTATE, CO. KERRY.—Question, Mr. Murphy (Kerry, E.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 543

IRISH TRAINING COLLEGE GRANTS.—Question, Mr. William McKillop (Sligo, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 543

DUNDRUM PETTY SESSIONS.—Question, Mr. Kendal O'Brien (Tipperary, Mid); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 544

BANK OF IRELAND AND GOVERNMENT MONEYS.—Question, Mr. William Abraham (Cork County, N.E.); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 544

THE UNSTEMMED TOBACCO QUESTION.—Questions, Mr. McKenna (Monmouthshire, N.), Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs), and Sir Fortescue Flannery (Yorkshire, Shipley); Answers, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 545

TRADES UNIONS AND TRADES DISPUTES BILL.—Question, Mr. Shackleton (Lancashire, Clitheroe); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 548

TRANSVAAL LABOUR ORDINANCE.—Question, Major Seely (Isle of Wight); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 549

THE RAND MINES.—Question, Major Seely; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Lyttelton, Warwick and Leamington) 549

ADJOURNMENT.—Major Seely rose in his place and asked leave to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, viz. :—" The cruel and improper treatment of South African Natives employed on the Witwatersrand Mines, as disclosed by the Report of Delegates and Correspondence relating thereto contained in the Blue-book, G. 4, 1904, lately presented to both Houses of Parliament at the Cape of Good Hope by command of His Excellency the Governor"; but the pleasure of the House not having been signified—

Mr. SPEAKER called on those Members who supported the Motion to rise in their places, and not less than forty Members having accordingly risen. the Motion stood over, under Standing Order No. 10, until this Evening's Sitting 550

NEW BILL.

Local Government Board (Scotland) Bill.—" To make further provision for Local Government in Scotland ; and for other purposes," presented by Mr. Maxwell ; supported by Mr. Ure, Mr. Hozier, Dr. Farquharson, Sir Charles Renshaw, and Mr. Dewar ; to be read a second time upon Monday, 16th May, and to be printed. [Bill 181.] 550

SUPPLY [8TH ALLOTTED DAY].
Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1904-5.

CLASS II.

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That a sum not exceeding £10,495, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Office of His Majesty's Secretary for Scotland and Subordinate Office, Expenses under The Inebriates Acts, 1879 to 1900, and Expenses under the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland Act), 1899, including a Grant-in-aid of the Congested Districts (Scotland) Fund."

Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland) 551
Dr. Farquharson (Aberdeenshire, W) 555
Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty) 558

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That Item A (Salaries) be reduced by £100."—(*Mr. Weir.*)

Mr. Asher (Elgin Burghs) 563
Captain Ellice (St. Andrews Burghs) 565
Mr. Harmsworth (Caithness-shire) 565
Mr. Ure (Linlithgowshire) 565
Mr. Maconochie (Aberdeenshire, E.) 566
Mr. Ainsworth (Argyllshire) 567
The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. Graham Murray, Buteshire) 567
Mr. Weir 569

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Original Question again proposed.

Mr. Munro Ferguson (Leith Burghs) 570
Mr. John Dewar (Inverness) 572

May 6.] *Page*

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That Item E (Congested Districts Board(Scotland), Grant-in-aid) be reduced by £100."—(*Mr. John Dewar.*)

Mr. Leveson-Gower (*Sutherland*) 579
Mr. Ainsworth 579
Mr. Maconochie 581
Mr. Weir 582
Colonel Denny (*Kilmarnock Burghs*) 587
Mr. A. Graham Murray 588

And, it being half-past Seven of the Clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee Report Progress ; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

Alleged Ill-Treatment of Natives in South Africa.—Adjournment (under Standing Order No. 10).

Major Seely (*Isle of Wight*) 592
Mr. Winston Churchill (*Oldham*) 592

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That this House do now adjourn." —(*Major Seely*).

The Secretary of State for the Colonies (*Mr. Lyttelton, Warwick and Leamington*) 606
Mr. John Ellis (*Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe*) 617
Mr. John Stroyan (*Perthshire, W.*) 601
Mr. Herbert Samuel (*Yorkshire, Cleveland*) 621
Mr. Seely (*Lincoln*) 628

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 150 ; Noes, 213. (Division List No. 115.)

Adjourned at fourteen minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS : FRIDAY, 6th MAY, 1904.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The Lord Chancellor acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with :—

Local Government Provisional Order (Poor Law) .. .. ..

And also the Certificate that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with :—

Humber Commercial Railway and Dock.

The same were ordered to lie on the Table 633

May 6.] *Page*

Lord Tredegar's Supplemental Estate Bill [H.L.].—Judges' Report received, Bill presented, and read 1^a 633

Mullingar, Kells, and Drogheda Railway Bill.—Thurles Urban District Council Water Bill. Read 2^a, and committed 633

Metropolitan District Railway Bill [H.L.].—Llanelly Harbour Bill [H.L.]; St. Bartholomew's Hospital Bill [H.L.]. Read 3^a, and passed, and sent to the Commons 633

Sutton Gas Bill.—Bishop's Stortford and District Gas Bill. Read 3^a, and passed 633

Kettering Improvement Bill.—Read 3^a, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons 633

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill.—Brought from the Commons; read 1^a; and referred to the Examiners 633

Ipswich Dock Commission Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments 633

Hampton-in-Arden Gas Bill.—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to 633

Metropolitan Police Provisional Order Bill.—To be read 2^a on Monday next. (The Lord Belper) 633

Metropolitan Common Scheme (Hillingdon East) Provisional Order Bill.—Metropolitan Common Scheme (Farnborough) Provisional Order Bill. House in Committee (according to Order); Bills reported without Amendment; Standing Committee negatived; and Bills to be read 3^a on Monday next 633

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No 2) Bill [H.L.].—Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [H.L.]; Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill [H.L.]. Read 2^a (according to order) 634

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

MALTA.—Further correspondence relating to the political condition of Malta (in continuation of [Cd. 1660], July, 1903 634

CENSUS OF IRELAND, 1901.—General Topographical Index 634

AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS (IRELAND).—Return of the prices of agricultural products and live stock, for the year 1903 634

TRANSVAAL.—Correspondence relating to conditions of Native labour employed in Transvaal mines.

Presented by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 634

VICTORIA.—1. Electoral Districts Boundaries Act, 1903. No. 1895. 2. Electoral Provinces Boundaries Act, 1903. No. 1896 634

May 6.] Page

POLICE ACT, 1890.—Correspondence relative to the refusal of the Secretary of State's certificate, under Section 17 (2) of the Act to the River Tyne Police Force, for the year ended 29th September, 1903 634

HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES ACT, 1890 (THE LONDON (PROVIDENCE PLACE POPLAR) IMPROVEMENT SCHEME, 1890).—Statement of modifications permitted by the Secertary of State for the Home Department to be made in the details of the London (Providence Place, Poplar) Improvement Scheme, 1901 634

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (IRELAND).—Two Orders with respect to the Urban County Districts of Bangor and Ballymena 635

SUPERANNUATION.—Treasury minute, dated 2nd May, 1904, granting a retired allowance toqHenry Edwards, Preventive Officer (Lower Section), London, Customs, under Section 2 of the Superannuation Act, 1887.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table .. 635

THE ROYAL NAVAL RESERVE.

Lord Muskerry 635

The First Lord of the Admiralty (*The Earl of Selborne*) 635

THE WHITSUNTIDE RECESS.—Question, Earl Spencer; Answer, The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (The Marquess of Lansdowne) 637

House adjourned at twenty minutes before Five o'clock, to Monday next, a quarter before Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: FRIDAY, 6TH MAY, 1904.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).—MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the follow-Bills originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz:—Ebbw Vale Urban District Water Bill [Lords]; Manchester Ship Canal (Finance) Bill [Lords.] Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time 637

Great Eastern Railway (Steamboats) Bill.—Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to 638

Doncaster Corporation Bill.—Read the third time and passed 638

Huddersfield Corporation Act, 1902 (Amendment) Bill [LORDS].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 638

May 6.] *Page*

Strabane, Raphoe, and Convoy Railway Bill (King's Consent signified).—Bill read the third time, and passed 638

Surrey Commercial Dock Bill.—Read the third time, and passed 638

Crystal Palace District Gas Bill; Gosport Water Bill [Lords]; Metropolitan Railway Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; to be read the third time 638

Tottenham Improvement Bill; West Metropolitan Railway (Abandonment) Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; to be read the third time 638

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 9).—Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to Bolton, Congleton, Keighley, Newton-in-Makerfield, Oswestry, and Wisbech, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Grant Lawson and Mr. Walter Long.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill.—"To confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to Bolton, Congleton, Keighley, Newton-in-Makerfield, Oswestry, and Wisbech," presented, and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed [Bill 182.] 638

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No 10).—Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to Chiswick, East Ham, Great Crosby, and York, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Grant Lawson and Mr. Walter Long.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill.—"To confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to Chiswick, East Ham, Great Crosby, and York," presented, and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 183.] 638

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 11).—Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to Guildford, New Sarum, and the County of Wilts, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Grant Lawson and Mr. Walter Long.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill.—"To confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to Guildford, New Sarum, and the county of Wilts," presented, and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 184.] 639

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 12).—Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the Ashton-under-Lyne and District, the Congleton and District, and the Wath, Swinton, and District Joint Hospital Districts, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Grant Lawson and Mr. Walter Long.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 12) Bill.—"To confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the Ashton-under-Lyne and District, the Congleton and District, and the Wath, Swinton, and District Joint Hospital Districts," presented, and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 185.] 639

May 6.] *Page*

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 13).—Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to Blackpool, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Tynemouth, and Wigan, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Grant Lawson and Mr. Walter Long.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 13) Bill.—" To confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to Blackpool, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Tynemouth, and Wigan," presented, and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 186]. 639

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 3).—Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board for Ireland relating to Castlerea (Rural), Midleton (Rural), North Dublin (Rural), and Westport, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland and Mr. Wyndham.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill.—" To confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board for Ireland relating to Castlerea (Rural), Midleton (Rural), North Dublin (Rural), and Westport," presented, and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 187.] .. 639

Elysée Palace Hotel Company Bill [LORDS].—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table 640

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.—That they have agreed to—Wellington (Somerset) Gas Bill, with Amendments.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, " An Act to confer further powers on the Clyde Valley Electrical Power Company; and for other purposes." [Clyde Valley Electrical Power Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, " An Act to confer further powers upon the Metropolitan District Railway Company; and for other purposes." [Metropolitan District Railway Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, " An Act to change the name of the Llanelly Harbour and Burry Navigation Commissioners to the Llanelly Harbour Trust and to alter the constitution of the Trust; to revive and extend the powers for the compulsory purchase of lands and for the execution of works under the Llanelly Harbour Acts, 1896 and 1901, and otherwise amend those Acts; to empower the Trust to borrow moneys with the consent of the Urban District Council of Llanelly and otherwise to alter and extend the financial powers of the Trust; and for other purposes." [Llanelly Harbour Bill [Lords.]

And, also, a Bill, intituled, " An Act to empower the Governors of Saint Bartholomew's Hospital, in the city of London, to demolish the Church of Saint Bartholomew the Less and to use the site thereof and the burial ground adjoining thereto for the purposes of the said Hospital and for uniting for ecclesiastical purposes the parish of Saint Bartholomew the Less with the parish of Saint Bartholomew the Great; and for other purposes." [St. Bartholomew's Hospital Bill [Lords.] 640

May 6.] *Page*

Clyde Valley Electrical Power Bill [Lords].—Metropolitan District Railway Bill [Lords]; Llanelly Harbour Bill [Lords]; St. Bartholomew's Hospital Bill [Lords]. Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills 641

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill.—Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table. Bill to be read the third time upon Monday next 641

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill.—Reported, with Amendments (Provisional Orders confirmed); Report to lie upon the Table. Bill, as amended, to be considered upon Monday next 641

Brymbo Water Bill; North Western Electricity and Power Gas Bill; Nuneaton and Chilvers Coton Urban District Council Bill [Lords]; Harlow and Sawbridgeworth Gas Bill [Lords]; Cambrian Railways Bill [Lords]. Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 641

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petitions for alteration; from Fraserburgh; and Dingwall; to lie upon the Table 641

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Cathcart, in favour; to lie upon the Table 641

ELECTIONS (HOURS OF POLLING).—Petition from Hackney, for alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table 641

LAND VALUES TAXATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Cathcart, in favour; to lie upon the Table 641

LANDS VALUATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Cathcart, in favour; to lie upon the Table 642

LICENCES (RENEWAL).—Petitions against alteration of Law; from Hanley (two); Stockport (five); Higher Tranmere; Everton; Nelson; Burslem (two); Liverpool; Enfield; Horsham (seven); Fenny Stratford (two); Hackney; Southampton; Wallsend-on-Tyne; Sunderland; Bolton; Cambridge; Brighton; Summertown; Allendale; Walton; Parton; Hove; Highgate Hill; Tiverton; Holloway; Manchester; and Bucknall; to lie upon the Table 642

LICENSED PREMISES (HOURS OF CLOSING).—Petition from Hackney, for alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table 642

LICENSING BILL.—Petitions against; from Brixham; Gillingham; Paignton; New Southgate; Kennington; Liverpool; Kilmaurs; Choppington; East Ham; Halstead; Stepney; Calne; Staines; Northumberland; Birkenhead; Conway; Alnwick; Westminster; Newcastle; Nottingham; Victoria Docks; Halton le Gate; Dinnington; Leominster; Congregational Union of Scotland; Truro; Backworth; Forest Gate; City Road; and Temperance Committee of the Independent Methodist Churches; to lie upon the Table 642

May 6.] *Page*

LIQUOR TRAFFIC LOCAL VETO (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Cathcart, in favour; to lie upon the Table 642

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (SCOTLAND) ACT (1894) AMENDMENT BILL.—Petition from Cathcart, against; to lie upon the Table 642

MINES (EIGHT HOURS) BILL.—Petition of the Scottish Trade Protection Society, against; to lie upon the Table 642

RE-VACCINATION BILL.—Petition from Royal Leamington Spa, in favour; to lie upon the Table 642

SALE OF BUTTER BILL.—Petition from Stamford, against; to lie upon the Table 643

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

CENSUS OF IRELAND, 1901.—Copy presented, of Census of Ireland, 1901 (General Topographical Index) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 643

AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS (IRELAND).—Copy presented, of Return of Prices of Agricultural Products and Live Stock for the year 1903 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 643

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (IRELAND).—Copy presented, of Two Orders of the Local Government Board for Ireland with respect to the Urban County Districts of Bangor and Ballymena [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 643

TRANSVAAL.—Copy presented, of Correspondence relating to Conditions of Native Labour employed in Transvaal Mines [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 643

SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1887.—Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 2nd May, 1904, granting to Henry Edwards, Preventive Officer (Lower Section), London, Customs, a Retired Allowance under the Act [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 643

POLICE ACT, 1890.—Copy presented, of Correspondence relative to the refusal of the Secretary of State's Certificate under Section 17 (2) of the Act to the River Tyne Police Force for the year ended 29th September, 1903 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 643

HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES ACT, 1890.—Copy presented, of Statement of modifications permitted by the Secretary of State for the Home Department to be made in the details of the London (Providence Place, Poplar) Improvement Scheme, 1901 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 643

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

MEDICAL STAFF OF MEATH HOSPITAL—ELECTION TO VACANCIES.—Question, Mr. Clancy (Dublin County, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 644

COUNTY COURT JUDGE'S DEPUTIES.—Question, Mr. Brynmor Jones (Swansea District); Answer, Sir Robert Finlay 644

POSTAL FACILITIES BETWEEN LONDON AND PARIS.—Question, Mr. Pirie (Aberdeen, N.); Answer, Lord Stanley 645

May 6.]

Page

EMPLOYMENT OF RURAL POSTMEN ON EXTRA POSTAL DUTIES IN THEIR SPARE TIME.—Question, Mr. James O'Connor (Wicklow, W.); Answer, Lord Stanley 645

ANNUAL COST OF MAINTENANCE IN COMMISSION OF A FIRST CLASS BATTLESHIP.—Question, Mr. Harcourt (Lancashire, Rossendale); Answer, Mr. Pretyman 646

LICENCES REFUSED—POSITION OF LICENSEE AS TO EXISTING COVENANTS.—Question, Mr. Gretton (Derbyshire, S.); Answer, Mr. Akers-Douglas .. 646

POPULATION OF LOCAL EDUCATION AUTHORITIES IN WALES AND MONMOUTHSHIRE.—Question, Mr. J. H. Lewis (Flint Boroughs); Answer, Sir William Anson 647

STUDENTS IN THE MARLBOROUGH STREET TRAINING COLLEGE.—Question, Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 647

BALLINASLOE LUNATIC ASYLUM—ELECTION OF DR. KIRWAN.—Question, Colonel Nolan (Galway, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 647

Registration of Clubs (Ireland) Bill.—[SECOND READING]—Order for the Second Reading read.

Mr. O'Neill (Antrim, Mid.) 648

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

The Attorney-General for Ireland (Mr. Atkinson, Londonderry, N.) .. 650
Mr. John Redmond (Waterford) 655
Mr. William Moore (Antrim, N.) 656
Mr. Flynn (Cork County, N.) 657
Colonel Lockwood (Essex, Epping) 658
Mr. Thomas Shaw (Hawick Burghs) 658
The Solicitor-General for Ireland (Mr. James Campbell, Dublin University) 660
Mr. Hugh Law (Donegal, W.) 663
Mr. Gordon (Londonderry, S.) 664
Mr. Jordan (Fermanagh, S.) 665
Sir William Tomlinson (Preston) 665
Mr. Nannetti (Dublin, College Green) 666
Mr. Mooney (Dublin County, S.) 667
Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.) 668

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed to the Standing Committee on Trade, Etc.

Aged Pensioners Bill.—[SECOND READING]—Order for Second Reading read.

Mr. Goulding (Wiltshire, Devizes) 669
Mr. John Hutton (Yorkshire, Richmond) 675

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. Brigg (Yorkshire, W.R., Keighley) 677
Mr. Cripps (Lancashire, Stretford) 678
Mr. Channing (Northamptonshire, E.) 681
Sir Carne Rasch (Essex, Chelmsford) 682
Mr. Crooks (Woolwich) 684
Sir Fortescue Flannery (Yorkshire, Shipley) 689
Colonel Lockwood (Essex, Epping) 691
The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Walter Long, Bristol, S.) 692
Sir Walter Foster (Derbyshire, Ilkeston) 697
Sir J. Fergusson (Manchester, N.E.) 699
Sir Michael Hicks Beach (Bristol, W.) 699

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed for Monday next.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.—That they have passed a Bill, entitled, "An Act to amend the Law in relation to the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children." [Sale of Intoxicants to Children Bill [Lords] 700

NEW BILL.

Outdoor Relief (Friendly Societies) (No. 3) Bill.—Bill to amend the Outdoor Relief (Friendly Societies) Act, 1894, ordered to be brought in by Sir Edward Strachey, Sir Albert Rollit, Sir Harry Samuel, Sir William Holland, and Mr. Rigg.

Outdoor Relief (Friendly Societies) (No. 3) Bill.—"To amend the Outdoor Relief (Friendly Societies Act,) 1894," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed [Bill 188.] 700

Old Age Pensions (No. 3) Bill.—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged; Bill withdrawn 700

Re-Vaccination Bill.—Order for Second Reading upon Monday, 16th May, read and discharged; Bill withdrawn 700

Adjourned at twenty-four Minutes before Six o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS, MONDAY, 9TH MAY, 1904.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with :—

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (Birmingham) [H.L.];

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 2).

May 9.] *Page*

And also the Certificates that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following have been complied with :—

Harrow Road and Paddington Tramways.

Donegal Railway.

The same were ordered to lie on the Table 701

Wolverhampton Corporation Bill.—Report from His Majesty's Attorney-General received, and ordered to lie on the Table 701

Manchester Ship Canal Bill [H.L.].—A witness ordered to attend the Select Committee 701

Trafford Park Dock and Railway Bill [H.L.].—Witnesses ordered to attend the Select Committee 701

South Shields Gas Bill.—The LORD BALFOUR informed the House that the opposition to the Bill was withdrawn. The orders made on the 19th of April and Monday last discharged, and Bill committed 701

Ipswich Dock Commission Bill (H.L.].—Commons Amendments considered, and agreed to 701

Richard Jaeger's Patent Bill [H.L.].—Committed 701

Hutchesons' Hospital and Hutchesons' Educational Trust Bill (H.L.]; Chippenham Gas Bill ; Sheppy Gas Bill ; North Staffordshire Railway Bill ; London, Tilbury, and Southend Railway Bill. Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Lord Estcourt be proposed to the House as a member of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Lord Aberdare ; read, and agreed to 701

Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Bill.—Read 2ª, and committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection 702

Marylebone Chapels (St. James, Westmoreland Street) Bill [H.L.]. ; Minehead Urban District Council Water Bill [H.L.] ; West Riding Tramways Bill [H.L.].—Read 3ª, and passed, and sent to the Commons 702

Doncaster Corporation Bill; Strabane, Raphoe, and Convoy Railway Bill ; Surrey Commercial Dock Bill. Brought from the Commons ; read 1ª ; and referred to the Examiners 702

Huddersfield Corporation Act, 1902 (Amendment) Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments 702

Great Eastern Railway (Steamboats) Bill.—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to 702

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (Birmingham) Bill ; [H.L.].—To be read 2ª To-morrow. 702

Metropolitan Common Scheme (Hillingdon, East) Provisional Order Bill ; Metropolitan Common Scheme (Farnborough) Provisional Order Bill. Read 3ª (according to order), and passed 702

May 9.] *Page*

Metropolitan Police Provisional Order Bill.—Read 2^a (according to order), and committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow 702

PETITIONS.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES (METRIC SYSTEM) BILL [H.L.].—Petition in favour of; of Bedfordshire County Council; read, and ordered to lie on the Table .. 702

STREET BETTING BILL [H.L.].—Petition in favour of; of Scarborough Branch of Anti-Gambling League; read, and ordered to lie on the Table 702

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.—Code of regulations for public elementary schools; with schedules.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).
No. 3153. Germany.
No. 3154. Turkey (Aleppo and Adana).
No. 3155. China (Swatow).
No. 3156. Greece (Morea, Aetolia, and Acarnania).
No. 3157. Argentine Republic (Rosario).
No. 3158. China (Wuhu). 703

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) CONTINUATION CLASSES.—Reports, Statistics, etc., 1902–1903 703

RAILWAY AND CANAL TRAFFIC ACTS, 1854 TO 1894.—Fifteenth Annual Report of the Railway and Canal Commission; with Appendix 703

CROFTER HOLDINGS (SCOTLAND) ACTS, 1886–1887.—Reports by the Crofters Commission, being for the year ended 31st December, 1903.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 703

LUNACY.—Report to the Lord Chancellor of the number of visits paid, the number of patients seen, and the number of miles travelled by the visitors of lunatics, pursuant to the Lunacy Act, 1890, between 1st October, 1903, and 1st March, 1904 703

POLLING DISTRICTS (COUNTY OF MIDDLESEX).—Orders, made by the County Council of Middlesex, altering certain polling districts in the Tottenham Parliamentary Division 703

UNIVERSITIES (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1889.—Annual Statistical Report, by the University Court of the University of St. Andrew's, to the Secretary for Scotland, under the provisions of Section 30 of the Universities (Scotland) Act, 1889, for the year 1902–1903.

Annual Report on the state of the finances of the University of St. Andrews under the provisions of Section 30 of the Universities (Scotland) Act, 1889, for the year 1902-1903.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table .. 703

TIBET.

Lord Reay 704
The Under-Secretary of State for India (The Earl of Hardwicke) 704

Education (Transferred Schools) Bill [H.L.]. [FIRST READING.].

The Lord Bishop of St. Asaph 704

Moved, " That the Bill be now read 1^{a}."—(*The Lord Bishop of St. Asaph.*)

Earl Spencer 710
The Lord Bishop of St. David's 711
Earl Cawdor 714
The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury 717
The Lord President of the Council and President of the Board of Education (The Marquess of Londonderry) 720

On Question, Bill read 1^{a}; and to be printed. (No. 72.)

Merchant Shipping Bill [H.L.].—[SECOND READING.]—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Lord Wolverton 722

Moved, " That the Bill be now read 2^{a}."—(*Lord Wolverton.*)

Lord Muskerry 725
Lord Inverclyde 728
Lord Ellenborough 729
Lord Brassey 732

On Question, Bill read 2^{a} accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

Prevention of Corruption Bill [H.L.].—House in Committee (according to order.)

The Lord Chancellor (The Earl of Halsbury) 734

Bill reported without Amendment, and recommitted to the Standing Committee.

Prize Courts Bill [H.L.]. [SECOND READING.].—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

The Lord Chancellor 734

Moved, " That the Bill be now read 2^{a}."—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

On Question, Bill read 2^{a}, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Friday next.

Bills of Exchange Act, 1882, Amendment Bill [H.L.].—[SECOND READING].—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

The Lord Chancellor 735

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a."—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

On Question, Bill read 2^a, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Friday next.

House adjourned at half-past Six o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS. MONDAY, 9TH MAY, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Private Bills [Lords] (Standing Orders not previously inquired into complied with).—Mr. Speaker laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz. :—Chesterfield Gas and Water Board Bill [Lords]; Harrogate Waterworks Tramroad Bill [Lords]; Leeds Corporation (Waterworks) Railway Bill [Lords]; Maidenhead Bridge Bill [Lords]; Neath, Pontardawe, and Brynaman Railway Bill [Lords]; South Staffordshire Mines Drainage Bill [Lords]. Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time 736

Provisional Order Bills (no Standing Orders applicable).—Mr. Speaker laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, referred on the First Reading thereof, no Standing Orders are applicable, viz. :—Commons Regulation (Merrow) Provisional Order Bill; Commons Regulation (Oxshott) Provisional Order Bill. Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time To-morrow .. 736

Plymouth Corporation Bill.—As amended, considered; to be read the third time 736

Barnard Castle Gas Bill [Lords].—Lancashire Electric Power Bill [Lords]. Read a second time, and committed 736

Thames River Steamboat Service Bill (By Order).—Consideration, as amended, deferred till Thursday 736

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill.—Read the third time, and passed 736

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill.—As amended, considered; to be read the third time To-morrow 736

Message from the Lords.—That they have agreed to—Sutton Gas Bill; Bishop's Stortford and District Gas Bill, without Amendments.

Kettering Improvement Bill.—With Amendments 736

May 9.] *Page*

PETITIONS.

Licences (Renewal).—Petitions against alteration of Law; from London; Leicester; Plymouth; Leicestershire; Shipley; Seghill (two); Stratford; Cheltenham; Swindon; Highworth; Battersea; New Delaval; Scholes; Wigan; East and Mid Surrey; Whitchurch; Alverstoke; Wincanton; Hanley; Throckley; Guildford; North Durham; Pilsby; Whitchurch; Newnham on Severn; Reading; Newcastle Emlyn; Great Yarmouth; Sparkbrook; and Bristol (two); to lie upon the Table 736

Licensing Bill.—Petitions against; from Luton; Merthyr Tydfil; Wakefield; Leicester (three); Mountain Ash; Awsworth; Paisley; Charles Forknall; Newark; Stonebroom; Belfast; Leamington; Willington Quay; Aston; Gateshead (eleven); Bloxworth; Greenock (twelve); Newburn; Seaton Burn; Gosforth; Poole (six); Market Harborough; Naseby; Morden; Lower Lytchett; Waterloo; United Kingdom Alliance; Street; Guildford; Dundee (two); Wood Green; Harrogate; Knaresborough; Inverness; Battersea (three); St. Cleares; East Ham; Hebburn Colliery; Willenhall; King's Lynn; Peterborough; Wishaw; Craigcuk; Durham; Trafalgar Square; Upton; Wigton; Great Harwood; Clapham; Lavender Hill; New Delaval; Willington; Pembroke Dock; Bradford (four); Southend-on-Sea (two); Coseley; Tunstall; Birmingham; Dunstable; Langdon Hills; Roden; Bristol; Deptford; Nantwich; Rotherhithe; Brixton Hills; Camberwell; Whitehaven; and Small Heath; to lie upon the Table .. 737

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday Bill.—Petition from Idle, in favour; to lie upon the Table 737

Workmen's Compensation Bill.—Petition from Bristol, against; to lie upon the Table 737

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Railway and Canal Traffic Acts, 1854 to 1894.—Copy presented, of Fifteenth Annual Report of the Railway and Canal Commission, with Appendix [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 737

Polling Districts (County of Middlesex).—Copy presented, of Orders made by the County Council of the County of Middlesex altering certain Polling Districts in the Tottenham Parliamentary Division [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 738

Education (Scotland) (Continuation Classes).—Copy presented, of Reports, Statistics, etc., on Continuation Classes (Scotland), 1902–3 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 738

Crofters' Holdings (Scotland) Acts.—Copy presented, of Report of the Crofters' Commission for the year 1903 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 738

University of St Andrews.—Copy presented, of Abstract of Accounts of the University for the year ended 30th September, 1903 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 162.] 738

University of St. Andrews.—Copy presented, of Annual Statistical Report by the University Court of the University of St. Andrew's for the year 1902–3 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 163.] 738

May 9.] Page

BOARD OF EDUCATION (CODE, 1904).—Copy presented, of Code of Regulations for Public Elementary Schools, with Schedules, by the Board of Education [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 738

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3153 to 3156 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 738

PAPERS LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.—Lunacy. Copy of Report to the Lord Chancellor of the number of visits made, the number of Patients seen, and the number of miles travelled by the Visitors of Lunatics between 1st October, 1903, and 31st March, 1904 [by Act];

Local Loans Fund. Accounts of the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt in respect of the Capital and Income of the Local Loans Fund for the year ended 31st March, 1903; with Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon [by Act]; to be printed. [No. 164.] 739

ULTIMUS HÆRES (SCOTLAND) ACCOUNT AND LIST OF ESTATES.—Return ordered, "of Abstract Account of the Receipts and Payments of the King's and Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer in Scotland, in the year ended the 31st day of December, 1903, in the Administration of Estates and Treasure Trove on behalf of the Crown."

"And of Alphabetical List of Estates which fell to the Crown as Ultimus Hæres in Scotland, administered by the King's and Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer in the same year."—(*Mr. Victor Cavendish.*) 739

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

EXTENSION OF JURISDICTION OF COUNTY COURTS.—Question, Dr. Shipman (Northampton); Answer, Sir Robert Finlay 739

RETURN OF LICENSED PREMISES AND LICENSES REFUSED.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 740

LICENSING BILL—COLLECTION OF COMPENSATION CHARGES.—Question, Major Jameson (Clare, W.); Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 740

THE VALUATION BILL.—Question, Mr. H. J. Wilson (Yorkshire, W.R., Holmfirth); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 741

ACREAGE OF WHEAT, BARLEY, ETC.—Question, Mr. J. A. Pease (Essex, Saffron Walden); Answer, Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes 742

POSTAGE IN ENGLAND OF LOTTERY CIRCULARS.—Question, Sir Thomas Dewar (Tower Hamlets, St. George's); Answer, Earl Percy 744

RECOMMENDATIONS OF MERCANTILE MARINE COMMITTEE.—Question, Mr. Loder (Brighton); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 744

LICENCES WITHDRAWN IN SCOTLAND FOR REASON OTHER THAN MISCONDUCT.—Question, Mr. Munro Ferguson (Leith Burghs); Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 745

LAND PURCHASE ACTS—PROTESTS OF IRISH JOINT STOCK BANKS.—Question, Mr. William Moore (Antrim, N.); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 746

SEWAGE NUISANCE NEAR CARRICKFERGUS.—Question, Colonel McCalmont (Antrim, E.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 747

IRISH DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION.—Question, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 747

ESTATE AT MOUNT SHANNON.—Question, Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 747

RETIRED VOLUNTEER SERGEANTS.—Question, Sir Fortescue Flannery (Yorkshire, Shipley); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 748

CONVEYANCE OF MILITARY PASSENGERS FROM CLONMANY TO LEENAN FORT, COUNTY DONEGAL.—Question, Mr. Murphy (Kerry, E.); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 749

COMMISSION OF CROWN AGENTS ON GOODS PURCHASED FOR SOUTH AFRICA.—Question, Sir Henry Fowler (Wolverhampton, E.); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 749

OUTPUT OF GOLD AND KAFFIRS EMPLOYED IN SOUTH AFRICAN MINES.—Question, Mr. Sydney Buxton (Tower Hamlets, Poplar); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton .. 751

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

ROYAL ARMY MEDICAL COLLEGE.—Question, Dr. Farquharson (Aberdeenshire, W.); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the War Office (Mr. Bromley Davenport, Cheshire, Macclesfield) 752

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR MEDALS FOR NATAL VOLUNTEER AMBULANCE CORPS.—Question, Sir Mancherjee Bhownaggree (Bethnal Green, N.E.); Answer, Mr. Bromley Davenport 753

BALLYBOY FARM—TERMS OF HOUSING BY WAR DEPARTMENT.—Question, Mr. Cullinan (Tipperary, S.); Answer, Mr. Bromley Davenport 753

ISLAND BRIDGE BARRACKS WORKSHOPS.—Questions, Mr. Nannetti (Dublin, College Green); Answers, Mr. Bromley Davenport 754

MILITARY STORES FOR IRISH GARRISONS.—Questions, Mr. Nannetti; Answers, Mr. Bromley Davenport 754

ROYAL COMMISSION ON MILITIA AND VOLUNTEERS.—Question, Captain Norton (Newington, W.); Answer, Mr. Bromley Davenport 755

FOOT GUARDS OFFICERS' OVERCOATS.—Question, Sir Carne Rasch (Essex, Chelmsford); Answer, Mr. Bromley Davenport 755

TRANSVAAL LABOUR ORDINANCE—PLAGUE AT HONG KONG.—Questions, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty), Sir Walter Foster (Derbyshire, Ilkeston), and Mr. Buchanan (Perthshire, E.); Answers, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Lyttelton, Warwick and Leamington) 756

MORTALITY IN SOUTH AFRICAN MINES.—Question, Mr. Trevelyan (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 757

May 9.] *Page*

CONGO INDEPENDENT STATE—CASE OF SILVANUS JONES.—Question, Mr. Emmott (Oldham); Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Earl Percy, Kensington, S.) 758

ALLEGED CONGO ATROCITIES—LETTER FROM BELGIAN CONSUL-GENERAL AT LIVERPOOL.—Question, Mr. Emmott; Answer, Earl Percy 759

THE CAPTURE OF ILLIG.—Question, Mr. White Ridley (Stalybridge); Answer, Earl Percy 759

VALUE OF LICENSED PREMISES IN SCOTLAND.—Question, Mr. Black (Banffshire); Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) 759

THE NEW FLORIN.—Questions, Mr. Ellis Griffith (Anglesey); Answers, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 760

LICENSING BILL—BREWERY SHAREHOLDERS AS LICENSING JUSTICES.—Question, Sir Thomas Dewar (Tower Hamlets, St. George's); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Akers-Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's) 761

POST OFFICE SORTERS' WAGES GRIEVANCE.—Question, Captain Norton; Answer, The Postmaster-General (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton) .. 761

RAILWAY RATES INQUIRY.—Question, Sir Edward Strachey (Somersetshire, S.); Answer, Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes (Huntingdonshire, Ramsey) 761

CARRIAGE OF MILK BY RAILWAY—LOCKED CHURNS.—Question, Sir Edward Strachey; Answer, Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes 762

LAND PURCHASE IN IRELAND.—Questions, Mr. Sheehy (Meath, S.) and Mr. Flavin (Kerry, N.); Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 763

COURTOWN HARBOUR.—Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde (Wexford, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 763

IRISH POLICE—MR. CRANES' LETTER.—Question, Mr. Murphy (Kerry, E.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 764

GARRYHINCH ESTATE, QUEEN'S COUNTY.—Question, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 764

LORD KILLANIN'S PROPERTY, COUNTY GALWAY.—Question, Mr. Roche (Galway, E.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 764

RAILWAY RATES FOR IRISH BUTTER.—Question, Mr. Joyce (Limerick); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 765

SERGEANT GALLAGHER'S PENSION.—Question, Mr. Delany; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 765

DIVISION OF UNTENANTED LAND BY ESTATES COMMISSIONERS.—Question, Mr. Hayden (Roscommon, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 765

May 9.] *Page*

LABOURERS' ACT—UNEXPENDED BALANCES.—Question, Mr. O'Dowd (Sligo, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 766

WEIR ESTATE, COUNTY SLIGO.—Question, Mr. O'Dowd; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 766

FLORENCE KNOX ESTATE, COUNTY MAYO.—Question, Mr. O'Dowd; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 767

ACHONRY NATIONAL SCHOOLS.—Question, Mr. O'Dowd; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 767

IRISH GUARDS AND THE R.I.C.—Questions, Mr. MacVeagh (Down, S.), and Mr. John Redmond (Waterford); Answers, Mr. Wyndham 768

BALLYVARLEY (COUNTY DOWN) DISTURBANCES.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 768

IRISH DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.—Question, Mr. Joyce; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 769

LISBURN DISTURBANCES.—Questions, Mr. Joseph Devlin (Kilkenny, N.); Answers, Mr. Wyndham 769

ALLEGED OFFENSIVE NOTICE AT PALLASKENRY.—Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy (Limerick, W.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 770

KILKEEL PETTY SESSIONS.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 770

IRISH LAND COMMISSION REPORT.—Questions, Mr. John Redmond and Mr. T. W. Russell (Tyrone, S.); Answers, Mr. Wyndham 771

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY AND PUBLIC HOUSE PROPERTY.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 772

BALLINASLOE ASYLUM MEDICAL SUPERINTENDENT.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 772

COUNTY MEATH SCHOOL TEACHERS' SALARIES.—Question, Mr. Samuel Young (Cavan, E.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 773

BANBRIDGE DISTURBANCES.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 773

BANK OF IRELAND AND IMPERIAL MONEYS.—Question, Mr. John Redmond; Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 774

SUNDAY POSTAL DELIVERY AT KNOCKNAGOSHEL, COUNTY KERRY.—Question, Mr. Murphy; Answer, Lord Stanley 774

DUBLIN COLLEGE OF SCIENCE.—Question, Mr. Mooney (Dublin County, S.); Answer, The Financial Secretary of the Treasury (Mr. Victor Cavendish, Derbyshire, W.) 775

LICENSING BILL.—Question, Sir John Leng (Dundee); Answer, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 775

VOTES OF ABSENTEE ELECTORS.—Question, Sir Elliott Lees (Birkenhead); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 775

May 9.] *Page*

Ground Landlords and Licensed Houses.—Question, Mr. Cremer (Shoreditch, Haggerston); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 776

Business of the House.—Question, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 776

A Question of Privilege.—Questions, Major Jameson (Clare, W.); Answer, Mr. Speaker 776

The Port of London Bill.—Questions, Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answer, Mr. Speaker 777

NEW BILL.

Parliamentary Voters (Registration) Bill.—"To amend the Law relating to the Qualification, and Registration of Parliamentary Voters and for other purposes relating to Elections," presented by Mr. Cremer; supported by Mr. Bell, Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. Burt, Mr. John Burns, Mr. Crooks, Mr. Fenwick, Mr. Arthur Henderson, Mr. John Johnson, Mr. Parrott, Mr. Shackleton, and Mr. John Wilson (Durham); to be read a second time upon Thursday and to be printed. [Bill 189.]

Licensing Bill [Second Reading.]—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. Burt (*Morpeth*) 778

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day six months.'"—(*Mr. Burt.*)

Question proposed "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Viscount Morpeth (*Birmingham, S.*) 787
Sir James Woodhouse (*Huddersfield*) 793
Mr. Cripps (*Lancashire, Stretford*) 796
Mr. Whittaker (*Yorkshire, W.R., Spen Valley*) 802
The Secretary of State for the Colonies (*Mr. Lyttelton, Warwick and Leamington*) 817
Mr. George White (*Norfolk, N.W.*) 826
Mr. Lloyd Wharton (*Yorkshire, W.R., Ripon*) 829
Mr. Atherley Jones (*Durham, N.W.*) 832

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the debate stood adjourned till this Evening's Sitting.

EVENING SITTING.

Milwr and District Mines Drainage Bill [Lords] (By Order). [Second Reading.]—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Sir Thomas Esmonde (*Wexford, N.*) 833
Sir Charles McLaren (*Leicestershire, Bosworth*) 835

Amendment proposed—

" To leave out the word ' now ' and at the end of the Question to add the words ' upon this day six months.' "—(*Sir Thomas Esmonde.*)

Question proposed, " That the word ' now ' stand part of the Question."

Mr. Yerburgh (*Chester*) 837
Mr. Moss (*Denbighshire, E.*) 838
Colonel Kenyon-Slaney (*Shropshire, Newport*) 838
The Chairman of Committees (*Mr. J. W. Lowther, Cumberland, Penrith*) 839
Mr. McKean (*Monaghan, S.*) 839
Mr. J. H. Lewis (*Flint Boroughs*) 840
Sir John Rolleston (*Leicester*) 841
Mr. Tomkinson (*Cheshire, Crewe*) 842

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 159 ; Noes. 61. (Division List No. 116.)

Main Question put and agreed to.

Bill read a second time and committed.

Licensing Bill.—Order read for resuming adjourned debate on Amendment to Question [9th May] " That the Bill be now read a second time."

Which Amendment was,

" To leave out the word ' now ' and at the end of the Question to add the words ' upon this day six months '—(*Mr. Burt.*)

Question again proposed " That the word 'now ' stand part of the Question."

Mr. Spear (*Devonshire, Tavistock*) 845
Major Jameson (*Clare, W.*) 847
Colonel Williams (*Dorsetshire, W.*) 851
Mr. Munro Ferguson (*Leith Burghs*) 853
Mr. Peel (*Manchester, S.*) 859

And it being Midnight the debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed to-morrow.

ADJOURNMENT.—Motion made and Question " That this House do now adjourn " —(*Sir A. Acland-Hood*)—put and agreed to.

Adjourned at one minute after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: TUESDAY, 10TH MAY, 1904.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with :—Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway (Steam Vessels).

The same was ordered to lie on the Table 865

May 10.]

Page

Croydon Gas Bill; St. Mary Woolnoth Bill [H.L.]; Brixham Gas Bill. Reported with Amendments 865

Alexandra (Newport and South Wales) Docks and Railway Bill [H.L.]—(on Re-commitment).—Report from the Committee read and ordered to lie on the Table. Bill reported with further Amendments 865

Sheppy Gas Bill—The LORD BALFOUR informed the House that the opposition to the Bill was withdrawn. The orders made on the 25th of April last and the 2nd instant discharged, and Bill committed 865

London, Tilbury, and Southend Railway Bill.—The LORD BALFOUR informed the House that the opposition to the Bill was withdrawn. The orders made on the 26th of April last and the 2nd instant discharged, and Bill committed 865

Huddersfield Corporation Act, 1902 (Amendment) Bill [H.L.].—Commons Amendments considered, and agreed to 865

Chippenham Gas Bill; Report from the Select Committee, That the Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the Bill, the opposition thereto having been withdrawn; read, and ordered to lie on the Table. The orders made on the 22nd of April last and the 2nd instant discharged, and Bill committed for Thursday next 865

Wolverhampton Corporation Bill; Humber Commercial Railway and Dock Bill. Read 2ª, and committed. The Committees to be proposed by the Committee of Selection 865

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill (No. 74); Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill (No. 75). Read 1ª, to be printed; and referred to the Examiners 866

Leicestershire and Warwickshire Electric Power Bill [H.L.]; Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Electric Power Bill [H.L.]; Great Yarmouth Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Cardiff Railway Bill [H.L.]. Read 3ª, and passed, and sent to the Commons 866

Ryde Gas Bill.—Read 3ª, with the Amendment, and passed, and returned to the Commons 866

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill. Brought from the Commons 866

Crystal Palace District Gas Bill; Tottenham Improvement Bill. Brought from the Commons; read 1ª; and referred to the Examiners 866

Metropolitan Railway Bill [H.L.]; West Metropolitan Railway (Abandonment) Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments 866

St. Marylebone Electric Lighting Bill.—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the five Lords appointed a Select Committee on the Hutchesons' Hospital and Hutchesons' Educational Trust Bill [H.L.], and one other Bill, do form the Select Committee for the consideration of St. Marylebone

May 10.] *Page*

Electric Lighting Bill; read, and agreed to; All petitions referred to the Committee, with leave to the petitioners praying to be heard by counsel against the Bill to be heard as desired, as also counsel for the Bill 866

Metropolitan Police Provisional Order Bill.—House in Committee (according to order). Bill reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3ª on Friday next 866

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (Birmingham) Bill [H.L.].—Read 2ª (according to order) 866

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

IRISH LAND COMMISSION (RULES).—Rule, dated 23rd April, 1904, as to Assistant Commissioners 867

LOCAL LOANS FUND (ACCOUNTS, 1902–1903).—Accounts of receipts and payments by the Commissioners for the reduction of the National Debt in respect of the capital and income of the Local Loans Fund, for the year ended 31st March, 1903, together with the report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act) and ordered to lie on the Table 867

Street Betting Bill [H.L.].—House in Committee (according to order).

Clause 1.

Lord Belper 867

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 1, page 1, line 5, to leave out from the word 'person' to the second word 'any' in line 9, and to insert the word 'frequenting.'"—(*Lord Belper.*)

Lord Davey 867

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Lord Davey 868

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 1, page 1, lines 9 and 10, to leave out the words 'or any place to which the public have unrestricted access.'"—(*Lord Davey.*)

Lord James of Hereford 868
The Lord Chancellor (*The Earl of Halsbury*) 868
Lord Newton 868
Lord Davey 869
The Lord Bishop of Hereford 869
The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (*The Marquess of Lansdowne*) .. 869
The Lord Bishop of Hereford 869

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Lord Belper 869

May 10.] *Page*

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 1, page 1, lines 10 and 11, to leave out the words 'or any house licensed for the sale of intoxicating liquors.'"—(*Lord Belper.*)

Lord Davey 870

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 1, page 1, line 11, after the word 'liquors' to insert the words 'on behalf either of himself or of any other person for the purpose of bookmaking, or betting, or wagering, or agreeing to bet or wager, or paying or receiving or settling bets.'"—(*Lord Belper.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Lord Belper 871

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 1, page 1, line 11, to leave out from the first word 'shall' to the end of the sub section, and to insert the words—(*a*) in the case of a first offence be liable, on conviction, under the Summary Jurisdiction Acts, to a fine not exceeding ten pounds; (*b*) in the case of a second offence be liable, on conviction, under the Summary Jurisdiction Acts, to a fine not exceeding twenty pounds; and (*c*) in the case of a third or subsequent offence, or in any case where it is proved that the person whilst committing the offence had any betting transaction with a person under the age of sixteen years, be liable on conviction or indictment to a fine not exceeding fifty pounds or to imprisonment, with or without hard labour, for a term not exceeding six months, without the option of a fine, or on conviction under the Summary Jurisdiction Acts, to a fine not exceeding thirty pounds or to imprisonment, with or without hard labour, for a term not exceeding three months, without the option of a fine, and shall in any case be liable to forfeit all books, cards, papers, and other articles relating to betting which may be found in his possession."—(*Lord Belper.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Lord Belper 871

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 1, pages 1 and 2, to leave out Sub-section (2) and insert the words, 'Any constable may take into custody without warrant any person found committing an offence under this Act, and may seize and detain any article liable to be forfeited under this Act.'"—(*Lord Belper.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Lord Belper 871

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 1, page 2, line 8, to leave out the words 'have the same meaning as in the Public Health Act, 1875" and insert the words 'mean any highway, public bridge, road, lane, footway, square, court, alley, or passage, whether a thoroughfare or not.'"—(*Lord Belper.*)

May 10.] *Page*

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 1, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 2.

Lord Belper 872
The Lord Chancellor 872

Amendment moved—

" To leave out Clause 2."—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

Lord Davey 873
The Earl of Aberdeen 873
Lord Newton 873
The Marquess of Lansdowne 874
Lord Davey 874
The Lord Bishop of Hereford 875

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 3.

Consequential Amendments agreed to.

Clause 3, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 4.

Amendment moved—

" In page 2, to leave out Clause 4."—(*Lord Belper.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Remaining clause agreed to.

Lord Davey 876

Bill reported, with Amendments, to the House and recommitted to the Standing Committee ; and to be printed as amended. (No. 73.)

NATIVE LABOURERS IN THE TRANSVAAL

Earl Carrington 876
The Under Secretary of State for the Colonies (*The Duke of Marlborough*) .. 876

THE UNITED IRISH LEAGUE.

Lord Muskerry 876
The Earl of Denbigh 877
Lord Clonbrock 877
The Earl of Cork 878

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes past Five o'clock to Friday next, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS. TUESDAY, 10TH MAY, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

MR. SPEAKER'S INDISPOSITION.—The House being met, the Clerk at the Table informed the House of the unavoidable absence of Mr. SPEAKER, owing to indisposition—

Whereupon Mr. JAMES WILLIAM LOWTHER, the Chairman of Ways and Means, proceeded to the Table, and after Prayers, took the Chair as Deputy Speaker, pursuant to the Standing Order.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).—Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That in the case of the following Bills, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz. :—

Llanelly Harbour Bill [Lords]; Metropolitan District Railway Bill [Lords]; Shipley Urban District Council Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time 879

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH).—Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with viz. :—

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill.

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time To-morrow 880

Wellington (Somerset) Gas Bill.—Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to 881

Crystal Palace District Gas Bill.—Read the third time, and passed. [New Title.] 880

Metropolitan Railway Bill [LORDS].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 880

Tottenham Improvement Bill.—Read the third time, and passed 880

West Metropolitan Railway (Abandonment) Bill [LORDS].—Read the third time, and passed, with an Amendment 880

City of London (Central Criminal Court House) Bill.—Read a second time, and committed 880

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill.—Read the third time, and passed 880

May 10.] *Page*

Commons Regulation (Merrow) Provisional Order Bill; Commons Regulation (Oxshott) Provisional Order Bill. Read a second time, and committed 880

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 14.)—Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to Brighouse, Pwllheli, Wath-upon-Dearne, and Worthing, and the North Staffordshire Joint Smallpox Hospital District, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Grant Lawson and Mr. Walter Long.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 14) Bill.—" To confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to Brighouse, Pwllheli, Wath-upon-Dearne, and Worthing, and the North Staffordshire Joint Smallpox Hospital District," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 190.] 880

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—Metropolitan Common Scheme (Hillingdon East) Provisional Order Bill; Metropolitan Common Scheme (Farnborough) Provisional Order Bill without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill intituled, " An Act to provide for the Sale of the Chapel of Saint James, Westmoreland Street; and for other purposes connected therewith." [Marylebone Chapels (Saint James, Westmoreland Street) [Lords.]

Also a Bill intituled, " An Act to provide for the transfer of the undertaking of the Minehead Waterworks Company, Limited, to the Minehead Urban District Council, and to confer further powers on the said Council with respect to the supply of water; and for other purposes." [Minehead Urban District Council Water Bill [Lords.]

And, also, a Bill intituled, " An Act to authorise the Wakefield and District Light Railway Company to construct tramways and a tramroad and other works in the West Riding of the County of York; and for other purposes." [West Riding Tramways Bill [Lords] 881

Marylebone Chapels (Saint James, Westmoreland Street) Bill [LORDS]; Minehead Urban District Council Water Bill [Lords]; West Riding Tramways Bill [Lords]. Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills 881

PETITIONS.

BILLS OF EXCHANGE BILL.—Petition from Walsall, in favour; to lie upon the Table 881

CANAL TRAFFIC BILL —Petition from Walsall, in favour; to lie upon the Table 882

EDUCATION (LOCAL AUTHORITY DEFAULT) BILL.—Petition from North Anglesey, against; to lie upon the Table 882

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petitions for alteration; from Dumbarton; and Orkney (two); to lie upon the Table 882

May 10.]

Page

False Statements (Companies) Bill.—Petition from Walsall, in favour; to lie upon the Table 882

Factory and Workshop Act (1901) Amendment Bill.—Petition from Walsall, in favour; to lie upon the Table 882

Licences (Renewal).—Petitions against alteration of Law; from Radstock; Nottingham (two); Carlingcott (three); Peasedown (three); South Twerton; Weston-super-Mare; South Shields (two); Somerset; Bulwell (two); Dulverton; Sileby (two); Carlisle; Feltham; Sheffield (four); Shipley; Bath; Northampton; Holt; Horsham (two); Bristol (two); Halifax; Strood; Chippenham; Atworth; East Islington; Sandgate; Folkestone; Southwater; Edinburgh; Bournemouth; Kilburn; Teesdale; Ashton under Lyne (two); Lewes; Sittingbourne; Sheerness; Rainham; Hoole; Warrington (two); Holborn; Latchford; Preston; Heeley; Darnall; Carbrook; Colyton; Deptford; Wokingham; Oakleigh; Douglas P. Lees; Wood Green; Roddy Moor; Sidmouth; Oldham; St. Leonards; Brixham; Hadleigh; Moorland Road; Ansty; Workington; Oldbury; Lancaster; Morecambe; Westbourne; Barrowford; Walton on the Naze; Dorset; Yeovil; Almwch; Holyhead; Normanton; Gloucester (two); Fenton; Liverpool (two); Brighton; Holywell; Weston; Tow Law; Maidenhead; King's Lynn; Dolgelley (five); Corwen; Norwood; East Dulwich; Penrhyn; Darlington; Nelson (six); Driffield (six); Ealing; Little Heath; Workington; Cockermouth; Stalybridge (two); Hebburn; South Tottenham; Astley Bridge (five); Bolton (three); Huddersfield (two); Leicester; Burnley; Accrington; Manchester; Brearley; Allerton; Miles Platting; Abergavenny; Griffithstown; Llanhilleth; and Bath; to lie upon the Table 882

Licensing Bill.—Petitions against; from St. Albans (two); Rochester; Bratton; Durham; Higher Openshaw; Bruntcliffe; Gospel Oak; Eccleshill; Feltham; Weston super Mare; Birmingham (three); Tunbridge Wells (two); Waterhouses (three); Westminster (two); Westbury; York (five); Malton; Rayleigh; Upper Poppleton; Shrewsbury; West Nottingham; Stroud; South Shields; Weston; West Twerton; Bulwell; Nottingham; Attercliffe; Pontmorlais; Lower Weston; New Wortley (six); Bishop Stortford; Warrington; Port (nine); Ynysbwl (nine); Hafod (three); Hopkinstown (two); Wolverhampton; Torry; Treforest (two); Pontypridd (fourteen); Cilfynydd (five); Penuel; Wattstown (two); Linton; Birkdale (two); Southport (seven); Blowick; Christchurch; Bournemouth (seven); Chesterfield; Ringstead; Oxford; Elland cum Greetland; Inverness; Bath (four); Aberdeen (four); Farnworth (three); Bolton (ten); Abingdon on Thames; Faringdon (two); Macclesfield; Northampton (seven); Loughborough (five); Kilburn; Leicestershire and Rutland; Islington; Llanrug; Harrogate (two); Keynsham; East London; Bloomsbury; Hornsea; Birstall; Finsbury Park (two); Widnes (eleven); Heywood; Wolsingham; Frosterley; Dundee (five); Rotherham (two); Eccles; Landore; Lancaster (two); Kearsley Mount; Moses Gate; Paddington; Clitheroe; Heywood; Dalton in Furness (two); West Dorset; Llantrisant; Trallwn; Coedpenmaen; Cardiff (two); Glasgow (four); Clydebank; Montacute; Norwich; Oldham; Dawley; Warrington; Bermondsey; Wiveliscombe (two); Axminster; Borthygest (two); Morfa Bychan; Battersea; Falkirk; Rotherhithe; Edinburgh; Derby; Burnley (four); Padiham; Bristol; Gloucester (six); Gosforth; Widnes; Torquay (three); Bury; Tredegar; Chester; Richmond; Hale; Somersham; West Ham; Eaglescliffe;

Tow Law; Bradford; Stratford; Blaenllochan; Preston; Tovil; Aston; Pontypridd and Rhondda; Treorchy (ten); Pentre (seven); Ystrad; Gelli; Trealaw (three); Sherwood; Ton Pentre (six); Clydach Vale (three); Cwm Clydach; Bleanrhondda (four); Ystradfodwg (two); Penygraig (two); Tonypandy (seven); Blaenclydach (three); Ferndale (six); Ynyshir (five); Tylorstown (four); Pontygwaith (four); Gilfach Goch; Treherbert (eight); Llwynypia (three); Ystrad (four); Trerhondda; Tynewydd; Bodringalt; Blaenycwm; Pentrhondda (two); Maerdy; Little London; Greet; Sparkhill; Tyseley; Workington; Camberwell; Holloway (four); Longhope; Crouch Hill; Greenock (eight); Liverpool (three); Whitley Bay (two); Burradon; Amble; Radcliffe; Whitley (two); New Hirst; Heywood (five); East Plumstead; East Ham; St. Andrews; Bowes Park; Harpole; Barrhead; Gourock; Stranraer; Gateshead (seven); Bury; London Wesleyan Methodist Conference; Coleford; Hopwood; Saltwell; Moor Lane; Blockley; Beccles; Crumlin (two); Blaenau Festiniog; Llandrillo; Westhoughton; United Free Church of Scotland; Gwynedd; Caersalem; Brixton; Glanrafon; Penrhyn Dendraeth; West Norwood; Barmouth; Dacre; Wisbech; Mansfield; Guiseley; Ryde; Isle of Wight (two); Mealsgate; Penrith; Chesterfield; South West Ham; Poplar and Bromley; Accrington; Oswaldtwistle; Hucknall Torkard; King's Lynn (three); Belfast; Keighley (two); Denholme; Merioneth; Edeyrnion; Birkenhead (three); Newport (Pembrokeshire); Stirling; Southend; Leigh on Sea; St. Leonards (five); Hastings (six); Carluke; Maesteg; Blaengarw; Peniel; Pontycymmer; Nantymoel (three); Pontychyll; Llanfyllin (five); Street (three); Maryport; Esk; Langley Moor; Bearpark; Sowerby; Greenfield; Dirkhill; Manningham; Walsall; Great Horton; Dursley; Uley; Eastcombe; Blackburn; Ely; Manchester (two); Marple; Patricroft; Langley Park; Burwell; Saltley (two); Winton; Frizington; Heckmondwike (two); Cleckheaton; Rookhope; Batley (two); and Cwmparc; to lie upon the Table 885

MORTGAGE OF PREMISES BILL.—Petition from Walsall in favour; to lie upon the Table 884

RAILWAYS (PRIVATE SIDINGS) BILL.—Petition from Walsall, in favour; to lie upon the Table 885

RATING OF MACHINERY BILL.—Petition from Walsall, in favour; to lie upon the Table 885

RE-VACCINATION BILL.—Petition from Gateshead, against; to lie upon the Table 885

RE-VACCINATION BILL.—Petition from Huddersfield, in favour; to lie upon the Table 885

TRADE MARKS BILL.—Petition from Walsall, in favour; to lie upon the Table .. 885

WAGES BOARDS BILL.—Petition from Walsall, against; to lie upon the Table .. 885

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES BILL.—Petition from Walsall, in favour; to lie upon the Table 885

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION BILL.—Petition from Walsall, against; to lie upon the Table 885

May 10.] Page

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

IRISH LAND COMMISSION (RULES).—Copy presented, of Rule made by the Irish Land Commission under the Land Purchase Acts, dated the 23rd April, 1904 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 165.] 885

GAS UNDERTAKINGS (LOCAL AUTHORITIES).—Copy ordered, " of Return relating to all authorised Gas Undertakings in the United Kingdom belonging to Local Authorities, for the year ended the 25th day of March, 1904 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 330, of Session 1903)."—(*Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) 885

GAS UNDERTAKINGS.—Copy ordered, " of Return relating to all authorised Gas Undertakings in the United Kingdom other than those of Local Authorities, for the year ended the 31st day of December, 1903 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 331, of Session 1903)."—(*Mr. Gerald Balfour*) 885

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

LIGHT DUES AND LIGHTHOUSE EXPENDITURE.—Question, Mr. Plummer (Newcastle-on-Tyne); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 886

IRISH LIGHTS BOARD—INSTRUCTIONS TO LIGHTSHIP KEEPERS.—Question, Major Jameson (Clare, W.); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 886

REMOVAL OF PATHWAY IN ST. JAMES PARK.—Question, Sir John Leng (Dundee); Answer, Lord Balcarres 887

CORPORAL PUNISHMENT IN POOR LAW INSTITUTIONS.—Question, Sir Walter Foster (Derbyshire, Ilkeston); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 887

NEW GUNS FOR THE 4TH WEST YORK ARTILLERY VOLUNTEERS.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster .. 888

CHINESE LABOURERS IN THE TRANSVAAL—COST OF REPATRIATING WIVES AND CHILDREN.—Question, Mr. Sydney Buxton (Tower Hamlets, Poplar); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 889

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

NORTH SEA FISHERIES—SEA TEMPERATURE.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Pretyman, Suffolk, Woodbridge) 889

COASTGUARD BUILDINGS.—Questions, Mr. Claude Hay (Shoreditch, Hoxton); Answers, Mr. Pretyman 889

UNCLAIMED DIVIDENDS ON CONSOLS.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) 890

DOG LICENCES.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain .. 891

UNREGISTERED FRIENDLY SOCIETIES AND INCOME TAX.—Question, Mr. George Whiteley (Yorkshire, W.R., Pudsey); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain .. 892

ORKNEY MAIL DELAYS.—Question Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland); Answer, The Postmaster-General (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton) 892

May 10.] *Page*

British Mail Steamers Searched by Belligerents.—Question, Sir Charles Palmer (Durham, Jarrow); Answer, Lord Stanley 893

Joyce Green Smallpox Hospital—Inoculation of Dogs.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Akers Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's) 893

Military Convicts.—Question, Mr. Claude Hay; Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 894

Avoch Harbour.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central) 894

Irish Fishermen and the Labourers Act.—Question Mr. Sheehan (Cork County, Mid.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 894

Aughris Fishing Station.—Question, Mr. William McKillop (Sligo, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 895

Vagrancy in Ireland.—Question, Mr. Hugh Law (Donegal, W.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 895

Irish Department of Agriculture.—Question, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 896

Deportation of Paupers to Ireland.—Question, Mr. Delany; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 896

Parish Committees in North Leitrim.—Question, Mr. P. A. M'Hugh (Leitrim, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 897

Irish Education Evening School Grants.—Question, Mr. Sheehan; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 897

Selection (Standing Committees).—Mr. Halsey reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Member from the Standing Committee on Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping and Manufactures, Mr. Walter Long; and had appointed in substitution, Mr. Grant Lawson.

Report to lie upon the Table 898

Selection (Standing Committees).—Mr. Halsey reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had added to the Standing Committee on Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufactures, the following Fifteen Members in respect of the Registration of Clubs (Ireland) Bill:—Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland, Mr. Crean, Sir Thomas Esmonde, Mr. Flynn, Mr. John Gordon, Sir James Haslett, Mr. Hugh Law, Mr. Leamy, Colonel Lockwood, Mr. Lonsdale, Mr. Moore, Mr. Nannetti, Mr. O'Neill. Mr. John Redmond, and Mr. Solicitor-General for Ireland.

Report to lie upon the Table 898

Selection (Standing Committees).—Mr. Halsey reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had added to the Standing Committee on Law, and Courts of Justice, and Legal Procedure, the following Fifteen Members in respect of the Bishoprics of Southwark and Birmingham Bill :—Mr. A. J. Balfour, Mr. Griffith-Boscawen, Mr. Causton, Mr. Emmott, Mr. Ellis Griffith, Sir John Gorst, Sir William Gurdon, Mr. Hugh Law, Mr. Lowe, Mr. Charles McArthur, Sir Robert Mowbray, Mr. Newdigate, Colonel Sandys, Mr. Austin Taylor, and Mr. Tuff.

Report to lie upon the Table 898

Weights and Measures Bill.—Reported, with Amendments, from the Standing Committee on Law, etc.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 166.]

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 166.]

Bill, as amended (in the Standing Committee), to be taken into consideration to-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 191.] 899

NEW BILL.

Constabulary (Ireland) Bill.—"To amend The Constabulary (Ireland) Redistribution Act, 1885," presented by Mr. Wyndham ; supported by Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland ; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 192.] 899

Licensing Bill. [Second Reading].—Order read, for resuming adjourned Debate on Amendment to Question (9th May), "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Which Amendment was—

"To leave out the word 'now' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day six months.'"—(*Mr. Burt.*)

Question again proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Debate resumed.

Mr. Peel (*Manchester, S.*) 899
Dr. Hutchinson (*Sussex, Rye*) 902
Mr. Worsley-Taylor (*Lancashire, Blackpool*) 907
Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (*Stirling Burghs*) 915
The Solicitor General (*Sir Edward Carson, Oxford University*) 926
Mr. Lloyd-George (*Carnarvon Boroughs*) 940
Mr. Butcher (*York*) 950
Mr. Ashton (*Bedfordshire, Luton*) 956
Sir E. Durning-Lawrence (*Cornwall, Truro*) 960
Mr. Samuel Young (*Cavan, E.*) 961
Mr. Austin Taylor (*Liverpool, East Toxteth*) 964

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the debate stood adjourned until this Evening's Sitting.

EVENING SITTING.

Licensing Bill. [Second Reading.]—Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on Amendment to Question [9th May], " That the Bill be now read a second time."

Which Amendment was—

" To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day six months.' "—(*Mr. Burt.*)

Question again proposed, " That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Mr. Austin Taylor 965
Mr. Tomkinson (*Cheshire, Crewe*) 969
Sir Thomas Dewar (*Tower Hamlets, St. George's*) 971
Mr. Crooks (*Woolwich*) 972
Mr. Corbett (*Glasgow, Tradeston*) 976
Mr. Emmott (*Oldham*) 980
Mr. Henry Hobhouse (*Somersetshire, E.*) 988
The Secretary of State for the Home Department (*Mr. Akers-Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's*) 992
Mr. Ellis Griffith (*Anglesey*) 1000

And, it being Midnight, the debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed to-morrow.

Adjourned at five minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS : WEDNESDAY, 11th MAY, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

Mr. Speaker's Indisposition.—The House being met, the Clerk at the Table informed the House of the unavoidable absence of Mr. Speaker, owing to the continuance of his indisposition.

Whereupon Mr. James William Lowther, the Chairman of Ways and Means, proceeded to the Table, and, after Prayers, took the Chair as Deputy Speaker, pursuant to the Standing Order.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Ebbw Vale Urban District Water Bill [Lords]; Manchester Ship Canal (Finance Bill [Lords]. Read a second time, and committed 1001

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill.—Read a second time, and committed 1001

Carlisle Corporation Bill.—Reported from the Police and Sanitary Committee, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed .. 1001

May 11.] *Page*

PETITIONS.

Education (Scotland) Bill.—Petitions for alteration; from Largs; Weem; and Wick and Pulteneytown; to lie upon the Table 1001

House-Letting (Scotland) Bill.—Petition from Ayr, against; to lie upon the Table 1001

Licences (Renewal).—Petitions against alteration of Law; from Chelmsford; Goldenhill; Stoke on Trent; Bath; Market Rasen; Finchley Road; Liverpool; Lacock; Petersfield; Corsham; Pentonville; Wiltshire; North Shields (two); North East Kent; Faversham; Higher Broughton; Coed Poeth; Islington; Durham; Newfield; Tunstall; Keynsham; Brixton; Lincoln; New Seaham; Newbottle; Salford; Pelton Fell; North Durham; Salford Dock; Folkestone (two); Preston; Stratton St. Margarets; Swindon; Littlehampton, Manchester (five); Horncastle; North End Road; Smalley Common; Dewsbury; Gorse Hill; New Ferry; Fulham; Wandsworth Common; East Gwent; Aberdare (two); Moses Gate; Darlington (twenty-one); North Devon; Patricroft; Penzance; Urmston; Farnworth; Stockport (two); Hove; Wroxall; Scarborough; Trafford Park; Thornton Heath; Tiverton; Walham Green; Lower Wortley; Hebburn; Swindon (five); Stockton on Tees; Thornaby; Hartlepool; Retford; Poplar; Bideford; Clenchwarton; Tilehurst; Pangbourne; Dearham; Harrington; Cheetwood; Aspatria; Kirkbride; Nuneaton; Cheetham Hill; Hillsborough; Worcester; Bradford; Gloucester; Aston; Campbeltown; Middlesborough (two); and North Ormesby; to lie upon the Table 1001

Licensing Bill.—Petitions against; from Derby (nine); Knaresborough; Tynemouth; Percy Main; North Shields (two); Metropolitan Tabernacle; Spalding; London (two); Hastings; Derbyshire; Wheatley Hill; Thornley; Guisbrough (two); Upper Parkstone; Dorset; Tunbridge Wells (four); Higher Broughton; Skelton; Brymbo (eight); Ponkey; Coed Poeth; Sleaford (five); Market Rasen; Louth (seven); Shepherds Bush (two); Gresham; Sunderland (three); Elgin; Rawtenstall; Waterbarn; Lumb; Birmingham; Harrogate (ten); Shildon; Bishop Auckland (two); New Shildon; Newcastle under Lyme (three); Cranbrook; Heywood; Highworth (four); Kellah; Busby; Normanton (two); Lincoln; Earlsfield; New Silksworth; Muirkirk (two); Ryhope Colliery; Salford; Upper Tooting; Tooting; Southfields; Swalwell; Garesfield; Ouston; New Washington; Chopwell; Blaydon; Clara Vale; Durham (three); Dawley; Wrenthorpe; Attercliffe (two); Poplar; Brockley Bargoed; Porth (four); Pentyrch; Denny; Sheffield (two); Redcar; Brighton (three); South Shields; Haydon Bridge; Hexham on Tyne; Acomb; Henshaw; Corbridge; Hexham; Bardon Mill; Halton le Gate (two); Crewe (two); Ilkeston; Rusholme; Manchester (six); Fulham (four); Mid Annandale; Baillieston; Batley (three); Glasgow (five); Malton; Thirsk (two); Hoylake; New Ferry; Wallasey; Orkney; Melton Mowbray (two); Great Berkhamstead; Rickmansworth; Ashton under Lyne; Chipperfield; Ripon (two); Carlin How; Hutton Rudby; Norwich (two); Yorkshire; Ryhill; Barnsley; Falkirk (three); Lanark; Fence Houses (two); Stockwell; Westmorland; Selly Oak; Farnworth (seven); Huntingdon; Caerphilly; Senghenydd; Cilfynydd (two); Senghenith; Efailisaf; Abertridwr; Havod; Deri; Cadoxton; Rhydfelen; Treforest; Taffs Well; Rudry; Blaenllesham; Cardiff (twenty); Darlington; Longtown; Brixton; Dolton; Cheriton Fitzpaine; Northampton (five); Penzance; Carfury Gulval; Swinton (ten); Pendlebury (four); Worsley; Irlams o' th' Height; Chorley; Llandudno; Brixham; Torquay; Belfast (two); Overleigh; St. Helens;

Gaywood ; King's Lynn ; Barnes (two) ; Pensarn ; Tavistock ; Coalville (two); Stockport (five) ; Chesham ; Clipstone ; Nelson ; Dronfield ; Larbert West ; Bridgnorth ; Maidstone (four) ; Wanstead ; Morley ; Coventry ; Camberwell (two) ; Fleet ; Hindley Green ; Woodburn ; Allenheads ; Wedmore ; Highbridge ; Yalding ; Fleetwood ; Bradford on Avon ; Chelmsford ; Street ; Walton ; Wiveliscombe ; Minehead ; Machynlleth ; Heytesbury ; Manvers Street ; Bath (three) ; Lowmoor ; Clayton ; Wibsey ; Stratford (two) ; Calne ; Wilts ; Corsham (two) ; Church Gastard ; Petersfield ; Kendal ; Chippenham ; Darwen ; Cambridge ; Brighouse ; Blyth (four) ; Levenshulme ; Dukinfield ; Woodside ; South Norwood (two) ; Laisterdyke ; West Bowling ; Bradford (ten) ; Liverpool ; Bedlington (two) ; Thinford ; Croxdale Colliery; Hamsteels ; Broompark ; Lewes (two) ; Oxford ; Grimsby ; Stockton-on-Tees (two) ; West Retford ; Greenock (eleven) ; Leighton Buzzard (two) ; Luton (two) ; Chyangweal Lelant ; Evans Town ; Ross ; Avoch ; Temperance Advocates' Union ; Anderston ; Llantrisant (two) ; Horsham ; Temperance Committee of the Congregational Union of Scotland ; Rushden ; East Northamptonshire ; Wellingborough ; Worstead ; Port Glasgow ; Thornton ; Hanwell ; Loughborough ; Reading ; Newbury (two) ; Brampton Junction; Taunton ; Westminster ; King's Sutton ; Kilmarnock ; Craven ; Wood Green; Hull ; Rochdale (two) ; Kingston-upon-Hull ; Hirwain ; Aberdare ; Merthyr Tydfil (four) ; Abercanaid ; East Glamorgan ; East Kirkby ; Dumbarton ; Felling on Tyne (two) ; South Bank (three) ; Middlesborough (six) ; Vale of Alford ; Auchterarder ; Galston ; Ayrshire ; Mary Hammond and others ; Shettleston ; Ayr (two) ; Evesham ; Frizinghall ; Aston Manor ; Pollokshields; Lugar ; Busby ; Dennyloanhead ; Aberdeen ; Lochee ; Dundee (eight) North-West Yorkshire ; and Scarborough ; to lie upon the Table 1002

VALUATION BILL.—Petition from Dewsbury, for alteration ; to lie upon the Table 1004

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

NEW ZEALAND.—Copy presented of Correspondence relating to The Preferential and Reciprocal Trade Act, 1903 [by Command] ; to lie upon the Table .. 1004

PRISONS (SCOTLAND).—Copy presented, of Rule made by the Secretary for Scotland as to the Constitution of the Visiting Committee to Inverness Prison [by Act] ; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 167.] 1004

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3157 and 3158 [by Command] ; to lie upon the Table 1004

EAST INDIA (INCOME AND EXPENDITURE).—Return presented, relative thereto [Address 10th March ; *Sir Henry Fowler*] ; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 168.] 1004

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.—Inquiry into Charities (County of Lancaster). Further Return relative thereto [ordered 8th August, 1898 ; *Mr. Grant Lawson*] ; to be printed. [No. 169.] 1004

COUNTY COURTS (IRELAND), REGISTRARS (SALARIES, ETC).—Return ordered, "showing the Salaries and Fees paid to each of the Registrars of County Court Judges in Ireland for the year 1903."—(*Mr. Condon.*) 1005

May 11.] Page

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

EDUCATION ACT—CHILDREN AND RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION.—Questions, Mr. Rose (Cambridgeshire, Newmarket); Answers, Sir William Anson 1005

SUGGESTED INCREASED PENSION FOR JOHN LAWLOR.—Question, Mr. Joyce (Limerick); Answer, Mr. Pretyman 1006

MAGILLAN CAMP POST OFFICE.—Question, Mr. Nannetti (Dublin, College Green); Answer, Lord Stanley 1006

PARCEL RATES TO EGYPT, JAPAN, ETC.—Question, Mr. Toulmin (Bury); Answer, Lord Stanley 1007

MALE LEARNERS IN LONDONDERRY POST OFFICE.—Question, Mr. Wood (Down, E.); Answer, Lord Stanley 1007

ALTERATIONS IN LONDONDERRY POST OFFICE.—Question, Mr. Wood; Answer, Lord Stanley 1008

THE ATHANASIAN CREED.—Question, Mr. Labouchere (Northampton); Answer, Sir Robert Finlay 1008

RETURN OF INDEBTEDNESS OF BOROUGH COUNCILS.—Question, Mr. John Ellis (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 1008

REGULATIONS FOR HEAVY MOTOR VEHICLES.—Question, Mr. Toulmin; Answer, Mr. Walter Long 1009

ARSENICAL POISONING—ADOPTION OF RECOMMENDATIONS OF ROYAL COMMISSION —Question, Sir Cuthbert Quilter (Suffolk, Sudbury); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 1009

CENSUS OF 1901 FOR SCOTLAND AND IRELAND.—Question, Mr. Toulmin; Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 1009

TAXES—COST OF COLLECTION.—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 1010

NATIONAL BANK OF IRELAND AND THE RECEIVABLE ORDER FROM UNDER THE LAND PURCHASE ACT.—Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde (Wexford, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1011

SICK PAY AND COMPENSATION FOR ACCIDENTS AT ROYAL ARMY CLOTHING FACTORY (ENGINEERS' DEPARTMENT).—Question, Mr. Shackleton (Lancashire, Clitheroe); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1011

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

NATIVE LABOUR ON THE RAND MINES—CAPE OF GOOD HOPE BLUE-BOOK.—Question, Major Seely (Isle of Wight); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Lyttelton, Warwick and Leamington) 1012

REPORT ON HEALTH OF NATIVES EMPLOYED ON THE RAND MINES.—Questions, Major Seely, Mr. Sydney Buxton (Tower Hamlets, Poplar), and Sir John Gorst (Cambridge University); Answers, Mr. Lyttelton 1012

May 11.] Page

NATIVE MORTALITY IN THE RAND MINES.—Questions, Major Seely and Mr. Sydney Buxton; Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 1013

CAPE COLONY LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY—RESOLUTION AGAINST CHINESE LABOUR. —Questions, Mr. John Ellis (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe), and Mr. Thomas Bayley (Derbyshire, Chesterfield); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 1014

TRANSVAAL MAGISTRACY.—Question, Mr. John Ellis; Answer, Mr. Lyttelton .. 1015

TIBET MISSION—COMMUNICATIONS WITH RUSSIA.—Question, Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.); Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Earl Percy, Kensington, S.) 1015

PROTECTION OF BRITISH INTERESTS AT NEWCHWANG.—Questions, Mr. Charles McArthur (Liverpool, Exchange) and Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answers, Earl Percy 1015

CONGO FREE STATE.—Question, Mr. Charles Douglas (Lanarkshire, N.W.); Answer, Earl Percy 1016

BOVINE TUBERCULOSIS—REPORT OF THE ROYAL COMMISSION.—Question, Mr. Field (Dublin, St. Patrick); Answer, The Secretary to the Local Government Board (Mr. Grant Lawson, Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) 1017

SMALL FARMERS IN IRELAND AND THE HOUSING PROBLEM.—Question, Mr. Sheehan (Cork County, Mid); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 1017

IRISH POLICE AND BANDS.—Questions, Mr. Hayden (Roscommon, S.), Mr. Murphy (Kerry, E.), and Mr. Flavin (Kerry, N.); Answers, Mr. Wyndham 1018

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY AND THE IRISH GUARDS.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh (Down, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1019

BANBRIDGE DISTURBANCES.—Questions, Mr. MacVeagh, Mr. John Redmond, (Waterford), Mr. T. W. Russell (Tyrone, S.), Mr. Seymour Ormsby-Gore (Lincolnshire, Gainsborough), and Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answers, Mr. Wyndham 1019

ARMS ACT IN IRELAND—CASE OF MARTIN JENNINGS.—Question, Mr. Roche (Galway, E.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1021

IRISH CONSTABLE AND GALWAY TEMPERANCE SOCIETY.—Question, Mr. Roche; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1021

IRISH ASSISTANT TEACHERS.—Question, Mr. Thomas O'Donnell (Kerry, W.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1022

PIERS IN THE DINGLE UNION.—Question, Mr. Thomas O'Donnell; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1022

KINGSTON ESTATE, COUNTY CORK.—Questions, Mr. William Abraham (Cork County, N.E.) and Mr. Lundon (Limerick, E.), Captain Donelan (Cork County, E.) and Mr. Murphy; Answers, Mr. Wyndham 1023

May 11.] *Page*

DEATH OF MICHAEL CURTIN IN CORK GAOL.—Questions, Mr. O'Shaughnessy (Limerick, W.) and Mr. O'Shaughnessy; Answers, Mr. Wyndham 1204

PALLASKENRY—OFFENSIVE PUBLIC NOTICE.—Questions, Mr. O'Shaughnessy, Mr. Joyce (Limerick), and Mr. Lundon; Answers, Mr. Wyndham 1026

RAILWAY RATES IN IRELAND.—Questions, Mr. MacVeagh and Mr. Field; Answers, Mr. Wyndham 1027

GAMBLING IN COTTON.—Questions, Mr. Field; Answers, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 1027

LICENSING BILL—TIME LIMIT.—Questions, Mr. J. A. Pease (Essex, Saffron Walden); Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1028

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—Questions, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs) and Mr. Gibson Bowles, Mr. John Redmond and Sir J. Dickson-Poynder (Wiltshire, Chippenham); Answers, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1029

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).—Mr. HALSEY reported from the Committee of Selection, That they had discharged the following Member from the Standing Committee on Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufactures:—Mr. John Redmond, and had appointed in substitution: Mr. Jordan.

Report to lie upon the Table 1030

COMMITTEES (ASCENSION DAY).

Motion made, and Question put, "That Committees do not sit To-morrow, being Ascension Day, until Two of the Clock."—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour*).

The House divided:—Ayes, 112; Noes, 96. (Division List, No. 117.) .. 1030

LICENSING BILL. [SECOND READING.]—Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on Amendment to Question [9th May], "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Which Amendment was—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day six months.'"—(*Mr. Burt.*)

Question again proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Mr. Ellis Griffith (Anglesey) 1033
Mr. Gretton (Derbyshire, S.) 1041
Mr. T. W. Russell (Tyrone, S.) 1044
Sir John Gorst (Cambridge University) 1052
Mr Yoxall (Nottingham, W.) 1056
Sir John Kennaway (Devonshire, Honiton) 1060
Mr. Theodore Taylor (Lancashire, Radcliffe) 1062
Sir Wilfrid Lawson (Cornwall, Camborne) 1067
Mr. Talbot (Oxford University) 1070
Mr. Asquith (Fifeshire, E.) 1072

Page

The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (*Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.*) 1082
Mr. Herbert Roberts (*Denbighshire, W.*) 1094

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The House divided :—Ayes, 329 ; Noes, 224. (Division List No. 118).

Question put accordingly, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

The House divided :—Ayes, 353 ; Noes, 196. (Division List No. 119.)

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed for Monday, 6th June.

EVENING SITTING.

PAYMENT OF MEMBERS AND RETURNING OFFICERS' EXPENSES.

Mr. Arthur Henderson (*Durham, Barnard Castle*) 1105
Mr. Fenwick (*Northumberland, Wansbeck*) 1109

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable and expedient that, in order to give Constituencies a full and free choice in the selection of Parliamentary Candidates, the charges now made by the Returning Officer to the Candidates should be chargeable to public funds, and that all Members of the House of Commons should receive from the State a reasonable stipend during their Parliamentary life."—(*Mr. Arthur Henderson.*)

Mr. Malcolm (*Suffolk, Stowmarket*) 1115
Sir Brampton Gurdon (*Norfolk, N.*) 1118
Mr. Randles (*Cumberland, Cockermouth*) 1119
Mr. Haviland Burke (*Kings County, Tullamore*) 1121
Sir Carne Rasch (*Essex, Chelmsford*) 1123
Sir Edward Grey (*Northumberland, Berwick*) 1124
The Secretary for Scotland (*Mr. A. Graham Murray, Buteshire*) 1129

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 155 ; Noes, 221. (Division List No. 120.)

POPULATION OF THE HIGHLANDS.

Mr. Ainsworth (*Argyllshire*) 1141

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a Select Committee be appointed to consider and report on the decrease of population in the Crofting Counties of Scotland and the causes of and remedies for the same." —(*Mr. Ainsworth.*)

The Secretary for Scotland (*Mr. A. Graham Murray, Buteshire*) 1141

And, it being Midnight, the debate stood adjourned.

May 12.] Page

Port of London Bill.

Motion made, and Question put, "That proceedings upon the Port of London Bill may be resumed."—(*Mr. Gerald Balfour.*)

The House divided :—Ayes, 165 ; Noes, 85. (Division List No. 121.)

Bill to be considered in Committee upon Monday next, and as amended in the Select Committee of last session, to be printed. [Bill 193.] .. 1143

Adjourned at a quarter after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS : THURSDAY, 12TH MAY, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

MR. SPEAKER'S INDISPOSITION.—The House being met, the Clerk at the Table informed the House of the unavoidable absence of Mr. Speaker, owing to the continuance of his indisposition.

Whereupon Mr. JAMES WILLIAM LOWTHER, the Chairman of Ways and Means, proceeded to the Table, and after Prayers, took the Chair as Deputy Speaker, pursuant to the Standing Order. 1145

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).—MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz. :—St. Bartholomew's Hospital Bill [Lords] ; Clyde Valley Electrical Power Bill [Lords]. Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time 1145

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH).—MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz. :—Local Government Provisional Orders (Gas) Bill. Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time To-morrow 1145

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS (NO STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE).—MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, referred on the First Reading hereof, no Standing Orders are applicable, viz. :—Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill ; Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill 1146

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time To-morrow 1146

Kettering Improvement Bill.—Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to 1146

Plymouth Corporation Bill.—Read the third time, and passed 1146

May 12.] *Page*

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway (Various Powers) Bill.—As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time 1146

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 4).—Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board for Ireland relating to the Rural Districts of Rathdown (No. 1) and Rathdown (No. 2), ordered to be brought in by Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland and Mr. Wyndham.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill.—"To confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board for Ireland relating to the Rural districts of Rathdown (No. 1) and Rathdown (No. 2)," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 194.] 1146

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill.—Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table. Bill to be read the third time to-morrow 1146

Liverpool and London and Globe Insurance Company Bill [LORDS].—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table 1146

Chesterfield Corporation (Tramways and Improvements) Bill [LORDS].—University of Leeds Bill [Lords]. Yorktown and Blackwater Gas Bill [Lords]. Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 1146

RAILWAY BILLS (GROUP No. 5).—Mr. COMPTON RICKETT reported from the Committee on Group No. 5 of Railway Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, they had adjourned till Tuesday next, at Eleven of the clock; Report to lie upon the Table 1147

RAILWAY BILLS (GROUP No. 8).—Mr. HENRY HOBHOUSE reported from the Committee on Group No. 8 of Railway Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, they had adjourned till Monday next, at Twelve of the clock; Report to lie upon the Table 1147

RAILWAY BILLS (GROUP No. 8).—Mr. HENRY HOBHOUSE reported from the Committee on Group No. 8 of Railway Bills; That Mr. Crean, one of the Members of the said Committee, was not present during the Sitting of the Committee this day; Report to lie upon the Table 1147

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petitions for alteration; from Dunoon; and Leith; to lie upon the Table 1147

LICENCES (RENEWAL).—Petitions against alteration of Law; from High Wycombe; Exeter (two); Wakefield; Essex; Ilford; Hampstead; Pendleton; Brentford; Hull (three); South Lambeth Road; Avon Valley; Hyde; Wimbledon; Lewisham (two); Lee; Hither Green; Portsmouth; Southsea; Preston; Sheffield; Stretford; Walworth Road; Hurstmonceux; Oldbury; Walbottle; Sugley; Newcastle on Tyne (four); Causeway Lane; Middlesbrough; North Devon; Bedford Row; Cheriton; Denbigh; North Wales; Swanscombe; Durham; Ealing; Acocks Green; Victoria (Mon.); South Birmingham; Tregarthen; Heanor; Penzance (four), Allendale;

Worthing ; Homerton ; Watlington ; Greenheys ; Rusholme ; Slough ; Tamworth ; Morton ; Bourne (three) ; Leigh ; Thurlby ; Wolverhampton ; Iver ; Upton Manor ; Cleveland ; Skinningrove ; Cale Green ; Plymouth ; Gorton ; Manchester ; Widcombe ; Great Saughall ; Cricklade ; Liverpool ; Oldham ; and Boston ; to lie upon the Table 1148

LICENSING BILL.—Petitions against ; from West Norfolk ; Hanley ; Upper Holloway ; Bootle (ten) ; Macclesfield (two) ; Liverpool (seven) ; Eston ; Newhaven (two) ; Devonshire ; Radnor Park ; Modbury ; Gateshead (five) ; Southport (five) ; Helmsdale ; Burradon ; Leicester (thirteen) ; South Bank (two) ; Chiswick ; South Acton ; Bournemouth (seven) ; Westbourne ; Christchurch ; St. Ives ; Halstead ; Glasgow (three) ; Teignmouth ; Dudley ; Wallsend ; Walker ; Walbottle ; Camperdown ; Bradford (two) ; Dunvant ; Clydack (three) ; Pontardawe ; Libanus Gorseinon ; Killybebyll ; Gillingham (two) ; Lewes ; Devonport ; Hylton ; Weston on Trent ; Wakefield (three) ; Wheatley Hill ; Saltcoats ; Lytehill ; New Lambton ; Headington ; North Metropolitan Union ; Fraserburgh ; Upper Parkstone ; East Ham (four) ; Hornchurch ; Ilford (two) ; Newton Abbot ; Haslington ; Fence Houses ; Greenock (two) ; Hove ; Stockport ; South Hackney ; Pendleton ; Great Horton ; Chudleigh ; Ballachulish ; Hull (two) ; Borough Green ; Lurgan ; Market Harborough (four) ; Oxford ; Cambridge ; Wandsworth Road ; Ringwood ; Brockenhurst ; Totton ; Fordingbridge ; Ossett (five) ; Oadby (two) ; Lutterworth ; Southampton (two) ; Morley (three) ; Falmouth ; South Ossett ; Studley ; Teddington ; Larkhall ; Westminster ; Strathaven ; Coupar Angus ; Lewisham (three) ; Forest Hill ; Deer ; Blairgowrie ; Wallington ; Boness ; Dunoon ; Bath (two) ; Stranraer ; East Nottingham ; East Belfast ; Haverfordwest ; Calne ; Chippenham (five) ; Lacock (two) ; Kington Langley ; Kington St. Michael ; Stretford ; Kelveden ; Foxton ; Lambeth ; Godalming ; Gosforth ; Pontardawe ; Llansamlet Attleborough ; Bolton (three) ; Royston ; Truro ; Ballymena ; Edinburgh (five) ; Hornsey ; Luton ; Derby ; Abergele ; Ipswich ; Wavertree West ; East Wickham ; Bexley Heath ; Lichfield ; Erith ; Orpington ; Middlesex ; Barnstaple ; Grangetown (two) ; Swansea (three) ; Blackpool ; Dartford ; Balsall Heath ; East Bradford ; Willington ; Woodhouse Carr ; Bardon Park ; St. George in the East ; Horton ; Plymouth (two) ; Saint Andrew ; Newcastle upon Tyne (eight) ; Tiverton ; Grantham ; Aberdeen ; Mid Shropshire ; Slough ; Hurstmonceux ; Burranown and Camperdown ; Lynton ; Appledon ; Combe Martin (two) ; Bideford ; Ombersley ; Torquay (three) ; Rhymney ; Tredegar ; Cwmsyfiog ; Durham ; Oldham ; Royton ; Hollinwood ; Chelsea (two) ; Kensington ; Stroud Green ; Hull ; North of England Temperance League ; Buxton ; Bradwell ; Glossop ; Harringay ; Westcliffe on Sea ; Staines ; Rugby ; Woodford ; Windsor ; Thame ; Henley on Thames ; Manchester ; York ; Kidlington ; Mynydd Bach ; Heaton ; Bourne ; Birmingham (four) ; Worcester ; Bristol ; Castleton (five) ; Turiff ; Redcar ; Kilmarnock ; Dumbarton ; Port Glasgow ; Stranraer (two) ; Throop and Moordawn (two) ; Branksome ; Wiltshire ; Weymouth ; Machynlleth ; Bont ; Bootle cum Linacre ; West Fife ; Lochgelly ; Hollinwood ; Sheffield ; Buckhaven (two) ; Micheldever ; Nottingham ; Whitehaven ; Whitchurch ; Penrith ; Wigton ; Higher Openshaw ; Sunnyside ; Alnwick ; Teddington ; Bedfont ; Poplar ; Leeds ; and West Gorton ; to lie upon the Table 1148

MERCHANT SHIPPING (LIGHTHOUSES) BILL.—Petition from Newcastle and Gateshead, in favour ; to lie upon the Table 1149

MUSICAL COPYRIGHT BILL.—Petition from Glasgow, for alteration ; to lie upon the Table 1149

May 12.] *Page*

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION.—Petition from Bath, for legislation; to lie upon the Table 1149

PUBLIC LIBRARIES BILL.—Petition from Bermondsey, against; to lie upon the Table 1149

SALE OF BUTTER BILL.—Two Petitions from Brighton, against; to lie upon the Table 1149

TUBERCULOSIS (ANIMALS) COMPENSATION BILL.—Petition from Newcastle-on-Tyne, against; to lie upon the Table 1150

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND).—Copy presented, of a Selection of Circular Letters of the Scotch Education Department, 1898–1904, with Explanatory Memorandum [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1150

EAST INDIA (ESTIMATE).—Copy presented, of Estimate of Revenue and Expenditure of the Government of India for 1903–4, compared with the results of 1902–3 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 170] .. 1150

EAST INDIA (FINANCE AND REVENUE ACCOUNTS).—Copy presented, of Finance and Revenue Accounts of the Government of India for 1902–3 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 1150

EAST INDIA (HOME ACCOUNTS).—Copy presented, of Home Accounts of the Government of India [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 171.] 1150

EDUCATION (IRELAND).—Copy presented, of Annual Report of the Commissioners of Education in Ireland for the year 1903 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1150

ULTIMUS HÆRES (SCOTLAND) (ACCOUNT AND LIST OF ESTATES).—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 9th May; *Mr. Victor Cavendish*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 172] 1150

GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS SECURITIES.—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 28th March; *Mr. Victor Cavendish*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 173] 1150

INEBRIATES ACTS, 1879 TO 1899 (REGULATIONS FOR STATE INEBRIATE REFORMATORIES).—Copy presented, of Regulations made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, in pursuance of The Inebriates Act, 1898, for the management and discipline of State Inebriate Reformatories [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 174] 1151

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.—Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, amending the Aldershot and Farnborough Light Railway Order, 1902 (Aldershot and Farnborough Light Railway (Amendment) Order, 1904) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1151

May 12.] *Page*

Light Railways Act, 1896.—Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, amending the Cranbrook and Tenterden Light Railway Order, 1899, and for other purposes (Kent and East Sussex Light Railway (General Powers) Order, 1904) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1151

Railway and Canal Traffic Act, 1888.—Copy presented, of Report by the Board of Trade in accordance with Section 24, Sub-section (4) of the Act, on the Schedule of Maximum Rates and Charges to be made applicable to the Canals of the Regents Canal and Dock Company [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 175] 1151

Lighthouses, etc. (Local Inspections).—Copy presented, of Reports to the Board of Trade by the Trinity House of Deptford Strond, the Commissioners of Northern Lighthouses, and the Commissioners of Irish Lights of their Inspection of Local Lighthouses, Buoys, and Beacons [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 176] 1171

Trade Reports (Annual Series).—Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3159 and 3160 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1151

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Inspection of Holdings on Powerscourt Estate.—Question, Mr. T. W. Russell (Tyrone, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1152

Return of Licensed Premises.—Question, Mr. Henry Hobhouse (Somersetshire, E.); Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 1152

Factories and Workshops—Fire Precautions.—Question, Mr. Tennant (Berwickshire); Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 1152

Postmastership of Ferns (Ireland).—Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde (Wexford, N.); Answer, Lord Stanley 1153

English and Irish Postmasterships.—Question, Mr. James O'Connor (Wicklow, W.); Answer, Lord Stanley 1154

Southport Post Office.—Question, Mr. Goddard (Ipswich); Answer, Lord Stanley 1154

Appointments for Learners in Central Telegraph Office, London.—Question, Mr. Cremer (Shoreditch, Haggerston); Answer, Lord Stanley .. 1154

Education Act — Appointed Day in Monmouthshire. — Question, Mr. McKenna (Monmouthshire, N.); Answer, Sir William Anson 1155

Electric Railway Signals for use in Fogs.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 1155

Local Government Act, 1888—Counties with Whole-time Medical Officers of Health.—Question, Mr. Frederick Wilson (Norfolk, Mid); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 1156

Proposed Erection of Sheds on Island facing Kew Gardens.—Question, Mr. Skewes-Cox (Surrey, Kingston); Answer, Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes .. 1156

PEKIN SYNDICATE—RAILWAY NEGOTIATIONS WITH CHINESE GOVERNMENT.—Question, Mr. Yerburgh (Chester); Answer, Earl Percy 1157

BANK OF IRELAND AND GOVERNMENT BALANCES.—Questions, Mr. William Abraham (Cork County, N.E.), and Captain Donelan (Cork County, E.); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 1157

WAR OFFICE STORES—DUTY ON ETHER.—Question, Mr. Ernest Gray (West Ham, N.); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 1158

SUM EXPENDED UNDER CLASS 5 OF CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES ON TRANSVAAL AND ORANGE RIVER COLONIES.—Question, Mr. Rea (Gloucester); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 1159

RETURN OF RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE OF THE IRISH SOCIETY.—Question, Mr. O'Doherty (Donegal, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1159

APPLICATIONS FOR RESTORATION OF HOLDINGS BY EVICTED TENANTS IN CARLOW.—Question, Mr. Hammond (Carlow); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1160

KILKEE SANITARY AFFAIRS.—Question, Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1160

TEACHING DIPLOMAS FOR STUDENTS OF ST. PATRICK'S TRAINING COLLEGE.—Question, Mr. Patrick O'Brien (Kilkenny); Answer, Mr. Wyndham .. 1161

IRELAND—LIABILITY OF LANDLORDS OF SMALL HOLDINGS FOR RATES.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1161

DISPOSAL OF SITE OF DUKE OF YORK'S SCHOOL.—Question, Mr. Whitmore (Chelsea); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1162

COST OF SOMALILAND OPERATIONS.—Question, Mr. Lambert (Devonshire, South Molton); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1162

NATIVES EMPLOYED BY MEMBERS OF WITWATERSAND NATIVE LABOUR ASSOCIATION.—Question, Mr. Sydney Buxton (Tower Hamlets, Poplar); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 1162

TRANSVAAL LABOUR ORDINANCE—REPATRIATION OF WIFE AND FAMILY OF A LABOURER.—Question, Mr. Sydney Buxton; Answer, Mr. Lyttelton .. 1163

TRANSACTIONS OF CROWN AGENTS FOR 1903.—Question, Mr. George White (Norfolk, N.W.); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 1163

DISTURBANCES IN BRITISH NEW GUINEA.—Question, The Master of Elibank (Edinburgh, Midlothian); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 1164

TRANSVAAL LABOUR ORDINANCE—POSITION OF NEGOTIATIONS WITH CHINESE GOVERNMENT.—Question, Sir John Leng (Dundee); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 1164

May 12.] **Page**

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

NAVAL WARLIKE STORES.—Question, Mr. J. H. Lewis (Flint Boroughs); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Pretyman, Suffolk, Woodbridge) .. 1165

THE CHINESE LABOUR ORDINANCE.—Question, Sir John Leng (Dundee); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Lyttelton, Warwick and Leamington) 1165

CHINESE LABOUR FOR THE TRANSVAAL—COST OF HOUSING INTENDING EMIGRANTS AT HONG-KONG.—Question, Sir Walter Foster (Derbyshire, Ilkeston); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 1165

MERCANTILE ASSOCIATION OF SWAZILAND—TRANSVAAL DUTIES.—Question, Mr. James Bailey (Newington, Walworth); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 1166

TIBET MISSION—ADVANCE TO LHASA.—Questions, Mr. Flynn (Cork County, N.), Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis) and Mr. Lambert (Devonshire, South Molton), Mr. Trevelyan (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland), Mr. Lough (Islington, W.), and Mr. Herbert Samuel (Yorkshire, Cleveland); Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) 1166

FRANCO-SIAMESE TREATY.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Earl Percy, Kensington, S.) 1169

THE SOMALILAND OPERATIONS.—Question, Mr. Lambert and Mr. Charles Hobhouse (Bristol, E.); Answer, Earl Percy 1169

INSANITARY LONDON POST OFFICES.—Question, Mr. Bayley (Derbyshire, Chesterfield); Answer, The Postmaster-General (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton) 1170

KENT WATER COMPANY'S WELL AT DARENTH.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease (Darlington); Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Walter Long, Bristol, S.) 1171

INCOME-TAX ABATEMENTS.—Question, Mr. J. H. Lewis; Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Victor Cavendish, Derbyshire, W.) 1171

HIGHLAND CROFTING COUNTIES—INSPECTORS OF THE POOR.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. Scott Dickson, Glasgow, Bridgton) 1172

FISHERY RESEARCHES—"GOLDSEEKERS'" HAULS OF FISH.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answers, Mr. Scott Dickson 1172

ISLAND OF LEWIS AND THE EQUIVALENT GRANT.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Scott Dickson 1172

IRISH DEVELOPMENT GRANT.—Questions, Mr. John Redmond (Waterford) and Mr. Kilbride (Kildare, S.); Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 1173

ACHONRY SCHOOL MANAGERS.—Question, Mr. O'Dowd (Sligo, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1175

Evicted Tenants in County Kerry.—Questions, Mr. Thomas O'Donnell (Kerry, W.); Answers, Mr. Wyndham 1175

Irish National Schools—Building Plans.—Questions, Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.) and Mr. Joseph Devlin (Kilkenny, N.); Answers, Mr. Wyndham 1176

Kellysgrove Bog—Turf Thefts.—Question, Mr. Roche (Galway, E.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1177

Mount Bellew Technical School.—Question, Mr. Roche; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1178

Deportation of Irish Paupers.—Question, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1178

Proposed Recreation Ground at Mallow.—Question, Mr. William Abraham (Cork County, N.E.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1178

Earl of Kenmare's Estate.—Questions, Mr. Murphy (Kerry, E.); Answers, Mr. Wyndham 1179

Irish Local Government Board Report.—Question, Mr. Sheehan (Cork County, Mid); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1179

Trinity College Head-Rents.—Questions, Mr. Flavin (Kerry, N.), Mr. T. W. Russell (Tyrone, S.); Answers, Mr. Wyndham 1181

Marquess of Drogheda's Kildare Property.—Question, Mr. Kilbride; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1181

Police Arrangements in County Fermanagh.—Question, Mr. Jordan (Fermanagh, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1182

Architect of College of Science, Dublin.—Question, Mr. Mooney (Dublin County, S.); Answer, Mr. Victor Cavendish 1182

Valentia Harbour Telegraph Station.—Questions, Mr. Boland and Mr. Flavin; Answers, Lord Stanley 1183

Derry Shipbuilding Yard.—Question, Mr. Murphy; Answer, Mr. Pretyman 1183

Fifth Battalion, Royal Irish Rifles.—Question, Mr. Wood (Down, E.); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the War Office (Mr. Bromley Davenport, Cheshire, Macclesfield) 1184

Irish Legislation.—Question, Mr. John Redmond; Answer, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 1184

British Guiana Immigration Ordinance.—Question, Sir Henry Fowler (Wolverhampton, E.); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 118

The Cunard Subsidy.—Question, Mr. Gibson Bowles; Answer, Mr. A J. Balfour 1186

The Tibetan Expedition.—Questions, Mr. Flynn, Mr. Lough, and Mr. Lambert; Answers, Mr. Deputy Speaker 1186

May 12.] *Page*

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).—

Mr. HALSEY reported from the Committee of Selection, That they had discharged the following Member from the Standing Committee on Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufactures: Mr. Grant Lawson, and had appointed in substitution: Mr. Hare.

Report to lie upon the Table.

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).—

Mr. HALSEY reported from the Committee of Selection, That they had dischargedthe following Member from the Standing Committee on Law, and Courts of Justice, and Legal Procedure: Mr. Solicitor-General, and had appointed in substitution; Mr. Attorney-General.

Report to lie upon the Table.

SUPPLY [9TH ALLOTTED DAY].

(Considered in Committee.)

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1904–5.—CLASS II.

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That a sum, not exceeding £10,259 be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for the salaries and expenses of the Office of the Commissioners in Lunacy in England."

Sir John Tuke (*Edinburgh and St. Andrew's Universities*) 1188
Sir Michael Foster (*London University*) 1196
Dr. Farquharson (*Aberdeenshire, W.*) 1197
Mr. Brigg (*Yorkshire, W.R., Keighley*) 1200
Mr. Gibson Bowles (*Lynn Regis*) 1202
Dr. Hutchinson (*Sussex, Rye*) 1204
Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice (*Wiltshire, Cricklade*) 1204
Sir John Dorington (*Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury*) 1207
The Attorney-General (*Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs*) 1209
Sir Edward Strachey (*Somersetshire, S.*) 1212

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That a sum, not exceeding £10,159, be granted for the said Service."—(*Sir Edward Strachey.*)

Dr. Farquharson 1212
Sir Robert Finlay 1212

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 126; Noes, 216. (Division List No. 122.)

Original Question put, and agreed to.

REVENUE DEPARTMENTS.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £6,400,618, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Post Office Services, the Expenses of Post Office Savings Banks, and Government Annuities and Insurances, and the Collection of the Post Office Revenue."

The Postmaster General (*Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton*) .. 1216
Sir Albert Rollit (*Islington, S.*) 1218
Mr. Nannetti (*Dublin, College Green*) 1219
Lord Stanley 1219
Mr. William Rutherford (*Liverpool, West Derby*) 1220
Lord Stanley 1220
Mr. Louis Sinclair (*Essex, Romford*) 1224
Mr. McCrae (*Edinburgh, E.*) 1224
Mr. Henniker Heaton (*Canterbury*) 1225
Sir John Leng (*Dundee*) 1228
Mr. H. C. Richards (*Finsbury, E.*) 1230
Mr. Nannetti (*Dublin, College Green*) 1233

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Resolution to be reported upon Monday next; Committee also report Progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

Milwr and District Mines Drainage Bill [LORDS] (By Order).

Mr. McKean (*Monaghan, N.*) 1241

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That it be an Instruction to the Committee on the Bill to insert clauses in the Bill providing for compensation water for the use of the riparian owners and other persons affected by the provisions of the Bill."—(*Mr. McKean.*)

Mr. Yerburgh (*Chester*) 1242
Sir Frederick Banbury (*Camberwell, Peckham*) 1243
Mr. Tomkinson (*Cheshire, Crewe*) 1244
The Deputy Chairman of Committees (*Mr. Jeffreys, Hampshire, N.*) .. 1244

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 59 ; Noes, 122. (Division List, No. 123.)

SUPPLY [9TH ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1904–5.—REVENUE DEPARTMENTS.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £6,400,618, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for the Salàries and Expenses of the Post Office Services, the Expenses of Post Office Savings Banks, and Government Annuities and Insurances, and the Collection of the Post Office Revenue."

Mr. Nannetti 1246

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item A, 1, be reduced by £100, in respect of the Salary of the Postmaster-General."—(*Mr. Nannetti.*)

Mr. William Rutherford 1251
Lord Stanley 1251
Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty) 1258
Colonel Lockwood (Essex, Epping) 1259
Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland) 1260
Mr. Thomas O'Donnell (Kerry, W.) 1262
Mr. Theodore Taylor (Lancashire, Radcliffe) 1264
Mr. Claude Hay (Shoreditch, Hoxton) 1265
Mr. O'Malley (Galway, Connemara) 1265
Mr. Slack (Hertfordshire, St. Albans) 1266
Lord Stanley 1267

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Original Question put, and agreed to.

And, it being Midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Resolution to be reported upon Monday next; Committee to sit again upon Monday next.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING (LONDON) BILL.—Ordered, That Mr. Bamford Slack, Mr. Bousfield, and Mr. Hayden be Members of the Select Committee.—(*Sir A. Acland-Hood*) 1268

Adjourned at five Minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: FRIDAY, 13TH MAY, 1904.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Trafford Park Dock and Railway Bill [H.L.]; Stretford Urban District Council Bill [H.L.]; Manchester Corporation (General Powers) Bill [H.L.]; Manchester Corporation Tramways Bill [H.L.]. Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Earl of Kimberley be proposed to the House as a Member of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Earl of Yarborough; read, and agreed to 1269

May 13.] *Page*

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with :—Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) [H.L.].

Also the Certificate that no Standing Orders are applicable to the following Bill :—Canal Rates and Charges (Regents Canal) Order Confirmation [H.L.].

And also the Certificates that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with :—Great Central Railway ; Doncaster Corporation.

The same were ordered to lie on the Table 1269

Trafford Park Dock and Railway Bill [H.L.].—A witness ordered to attend the Select Committee 1269

De Trafford Estate Bill [H.L.].—The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that in pursuance of Standing Order No. 163A relating to Private Bills, he had on the requisition of the Chairman of Committees appointed William Howard Winterbotham, Esq., of the Royal Courts of Justice, Official Solicitor to the Supreme Court of Judicature, as guardian or protector of the infants Humphrey Edmund de Trafford ; Rudolph Edgar Francis de Trafford ; Raymund Vincent de Trafford ; Hubert Edmund Francis de Trafford ; Geoffrey Edmund de Trafford ; Reginald Francis de Trafford ; Sicell Noel de Trafford ; Ralph Eric de Trafford ; Herman St. Michael de Trafford ; Oswald de Trafford ; Robert Ashton de Trafford ; Edward Aloysius de Trafford ; Cuthbert de Trafford ; Timothy John Aloysius O'Brien, Robert Rollo Gillespie O'Brien ; George Gilbert Joseph Clifford ; Walter Francis Joseph Clifford ; and Lewis Arthur Joseph Clifford, named in the Bill, to represent such infants before the Committee on the Bill 1269

Bristol Corporation Bill [H.L.].—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments 1270

Holywood Tramways Bill [H.L.].—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments 1270

North Wales Electric Power Bill [H.L.].—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments 1270

Chippenham Gas Bill ; Amersham, Beaconsfield, and District Water Bill. Reported, with Amendments 1270

Hutchesons' Hospital and Hutchesons' Educational Trust Bill [H.L.].—Report from the Select Committee, That it is not expedient to proceed further with the Bill ; read, and ordered to lie on the Table 1270

Great Northern Railway Bill.—The LORD BALFOUR informed the House that the opposition to the Bill was withdrawn. The order made on the 25th of April last was discharged, and Bill committed 1270

Metropolitan Railway Bill [H.L.] ; West Metropolitan Railway (Abandonment) Bill [H.L.]. Commons Amendments considered, and agreed to .. 1270

Harrow Road and Paddington Tramways Bill.—Read 2ª, and committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection 1270

May 13.]

Page

Done gal Railway Bill.—Read 2^a. and committed 1270

Whitby Gas Bill.—Read 3^a, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons 1270

Byth and Cowpen Gas Bill.—Read 3^a, with the Amendments; further Amendments made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons 1270

Plymouth Corporation Bill.—Brought from the Commons; read 1^a; and referred to the Examiners 1271

Wellington (Somerset) Gas Bill; Kettering Improvement Bill. Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to 1271

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [H.L.]. Committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection 1271

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill [H.L.].—Committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Monday next 1271

Metropolitan Police Provisional Order Bill.—Read 3^a (according to order), and passed 1271

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill [H.L.]. House in Committee (according to order). Bill reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3^a on Monday next 1271

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRANSVAAL.—Further correspondence relating to the Transvaal Labour Importation Ordinance (in continuation of [Cd. 1986], March, 1904 1271

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND).—Selection of circular letters of the Scotch Education Department, 1898–1904; with explanatory memorandum 1271

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).
No. 3159, United States (New York). No. 3160. Turkey (Trebizond). .. 1271

NEW ZEALAND.—Correspondence relating to the Preferential and Reciprocal Trade Act, 1903 1271

EDUCATION COMMISSIONERS (IRELAND).—Annual Report for the year 1903 .. 1271

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.—Kent and East Sussex Light Railway (General Powers) Order, 1904. Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, amending the Cranbrook and Tenterden Light Railway Order, 1899; and for other purposes.

ALDERSHOT AND FARNBOROUGH LIGHT RAILWAY (AMENDMENT) ORDER, 1904.—Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, amending the Aldershot and Farnborough Light Railway Order, 1902.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 1272

May 13.] Page

INDIA.

Home Accounts. Home Accounts of the Government of India.

Estimate. Estimate of revenue and expenditure of the Government of India, for the year 1903–1904, compared with the results of 1902–1903.

Finance and Revenue Accounts. Finance and Revenue Accounts of the Government of India, for the year 1902–1903 1272

PRISONS (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1877, AND SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND ACTS, 1885–89. —Rule made by the Secretary for Scotland as to the constitution of the visiting committee to Inverness Prison 1272

INEBRIATES ACTS, 1879 TO 1899 (REGULATIONS FOR STATE INEBRIATE REFORMATORIES).—Regulations made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department in pursuance of the Inebriates Act, 1898, for the management and discipline of State inebriate reformatories 1272

LIGHTHOUSES, ETC. (LOCAL INSPECTIONS).—Reports to the Board of Trade by the Trinity House of Deptford Strond, the Commissioners of Northern Lighthouses, and the Commissioners of Irish Lights, of their inspection of local lights, buoys, and beacons (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 176, of Session 1903) 1272

PATENTS, DESIGNS, AND TRADE MARKS.—Twenty-first Report of the Comptroller-General of Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks, with Appendices, for the year 1903 1273

RAILWAY AND CANAL TRAFFIC ACT, 1888.—Report by the Board of Trade, in accordance with Section 24, Sub-section (4), of the above Act, on the schedule of maximum rates and charges to be made applicable to the canals of the Regents Canal and Dock Company.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 1273

FEE FUND OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS.—The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid on the Table the annual Account of the Fee Fund of the House of Lords. The same was ordered to lie on the Table, and to be referred to the Select Committee on the House of Lords Offices 1273

Bills of Exchange Act, 1882, Amendment Bill [H.L.].—House in Committee (according to order). Bill reported without Amendment, and re-committed to the Standing Committee 1273

Weights and Measures (Metric System) Bill [H.L.].—House in Committee (according to order). The Amendments proposed by the Select Committee made; further Amendments made. Standing Committee negatived. The Report of Amendments to be received on Monday next; and Bill to be printed as amended. (No. 76) 1273

THE NEW SERVICE RIFLE.

Lord Tweedmouth 1273
Earl Stanhope 1281
The Under Secretary of State for War (*The Earl of Donoughmore*) .. 1282
The Earl of Erroll 1286

May 13.] Page

THE ROLL OF PEERS.

The Earl of Belmore 1287
The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (*The Marquess of Lansdowne*) 1287

Supply of Electricity Bill [H.L.].—[SECOND READING]—Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

Lord Wolverton 1288

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*Lord Wolverton.*)

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and referred to a Select Committee.

THE LATE LORD SALISBURY.

The Marquess of Lansdowne 1289

House adjourned at twenty minutes before Six o'clock to Monday next, a quarter before Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: FRIDAY, 13TH MAY, 1904.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS (NO STANDING ORDERS APPLICAPLE).—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That in the case of the following Bills, referred on the First Reading thereof, no Standing Orders are applicable, viz. :—

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill; Education Board Provisional Orders (Cardiff and Newport (Monmouthshire) Bill.

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time upon Monday next 1289

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH).—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz. :—

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill.

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time upon Monday next 1290

Brymbo Water Bill.—Cambrian Railways Bill [Lords]; London and India Docks Company Bill. As amended, considered; to be read the third time 1290

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill.—Read the tird time, and passed 1290

May 13.] *Page*

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill; Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (Gas) Bill.—Read a second time, and committed .. 290

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 7).—Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade, under the Electric Lighting Acts, 1882 and 1888, The Electric Lighting (Scotland) Act, 1890, and The Electric Lighting (Scotland) Act, 1902, relating to Barrhead, Bothwell, Eastwood, and Cathcart, Johnstone, Kilpatrick, Lanark, Renfrew, and Shettlestone, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Bonar Law and Mr. Gerald Balfour.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill.—" To confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade, under the Electric Lighting Acts, 1882 and 1888, The Electric Lighting (Scotland) Act, 1890, and The Electric Lighting (Scotland) Act, 1902, relating to Barrhead, Bothwell, Eastwood, and Cathcart, Johnstone, Kilpatrick, Lanark, Renfrew and Shettlestone," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 195] 1260

Radcliffe Tramways and Improvement Bill.—Reported, with Amendments, from the Police and Sanitary Committee [Section A]; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 1290

Lytham Improvement Bill.—Reported, with Amendments, from the Police and Sanitary Committee [Section B]; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 1291

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.—That they have agreed to—Ryde Gas Bill, with an Amendment.

Amendments to—Ipswich Dock Commission Bill [Lords]; Huddersfield Corporation Act, 1902 (Amendment) Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, " An Act to confer further powers upon the Leicestershire and Warwickshire Electric Power Company; and for other purposes." [Leicestershire and Warwickshire Electric Power Bill [Lords].

And, also, a Bill intituled, " An Act to confer further powers upon the Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Electric Power Company; and for other purposes." [Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Electric Power Bill [Lords.]

Also a Bill, intituled, " An Act to empower the Corporation of Great Yarmouth to construct tramways, street improvements, and other works, and to acquire the ferries arcoss the Haven, to make further provision in regard to the health, local government, and improvement of the said borough; and for other purposes," [Great Yarmouth Corporation Bill [Lords.]

And, also, a Bill, intituled, " An Act for empowering the Cardiff Railway Company to construct a new railway, and to abandon the construction of a portion of railway already authorised, and for amending the Acts relating to the Cardiff Railway Company; and for other purposes." [Cardiff Railway Bill [Lords] 1291

May 13.] *Page*

Leicestershire and Warwickshire Electric Power Bill [Lords] ; Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Electric Power Bill [Lords ; Great Yarmouth Corporation Bill [Lords] ; Cardiff Railway Bill [Lords]. Read the first time and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills 1291

PETITIONS.

Education (Scotland) Bill.—Two Petitions from Perth, for alteration ; to lie upon the Table 1292

Highways Bill.—Petition from Darton, against ; to lie upon the Table 1292

House-Letting (Scotland) Bill.—Petition from Dundee, against ; to lie upon the Table 1292

Licences (Renewal).—Petitions against alteration of Law ; from Blyth Bridge ; Kingsland ; Penarth ; Dinas ; Pentonville ; Islington ; Williamstown (four) ; Brixton ; Norfolk ; East Cornwall ; Cleveland and North Yorkshire ; Shaftesbury ; Great Grimsby ; Liverpool ; Coventry ; Great Yarmouth ; Arundel ; Darlington (three) ; Llandrindod Wells ; Holbeck ; Upper Stratton ; Lydiard Millicent ; Swindon (three) ; Chiseldon ; Wroughton ; Perth ; Shipley ; Central Yorkshire ; Ware ; Maida Vale ; Gateshead ; Durham ; Sudbury ; Wroxall ; St. Catherine's ; Manchester (two) ; Monkwearmouth ; Bracknell ; Humberstone ; Rochdale ; Gloucester (two) ; and Cowen ; to lie upon the Table 1292

Licensing Bill.—Petitions against ; from Lennahglow ; Glasgow (ten) ; Chelmsford ; Hackney ; Kirkcudbright ; Barry Dock (thirteen) ; Gilfach Goch (two) ; Porth (two) ; Whitehaven ; Tinyrefail ; Llanharon ; Porthcawl ; Bridgend ; Cardiff ; Dundee (three) ; Renfrew ; Cleave ; Wimbledon ; Blairgowrie ; Blandford ; Blackmoore ; Darlington ; Liverpool ; Preston ; Downton ; Usk ; Kilwinning ; Droitwich ; South and West Salford ; Hanwell ; Stockton-on-Tees ; Edinburgh (seven) ; Bradford (two) ; Aberdeen (two) ; Pollokshaws ; West Ham (two) ; Greenock (four) ; Foulsham ; Stoke Newington ; Bryn ; Eccleshill ; Attercliffe ; Royston ; Birmingham ; Ampthill ; Hamilton ; Bainsford ; Merthyr ; Oxford (two) ; St. Clement's ; Brotton ; Leominster ; Newcastle-on-Tyne ; Batley ; Totnes ; Dittisham ; Marylebone ; Edgeware Road ; Halifax ; Dumbartonshire ; Pembroke ; Brixton ; Middlesbrough ; Penygraig ; Calderhead ; Yorkshire ; Handsworth ; Villa Road ; Gateshead ; Islington (two) ; Sheffield ; Southampton ; Dumbarton ; Lochee ; Inverness ; Ayrshire (two) ; Larkhall ; Brixham ; Macclesfield ; Sons of Temperance Friendly Society ; Sanquhar ; Tallentire ; Red Lake ; Kilbarchan ; Torquay ; Monkwearmouth ; Sunderland ; Kingston ; Perth ; Hull ; Long Clawson ; Leicester ; Folkestone ; Llanstephen ; Cowes ; Leith (two) ; Granton ; Hastings ; and Merioneth ; to be laid upon the Table 1292

Public Libraries Bill.—Petition from Darton, against ; to lie upon the Table 1293

Roman Catholic Disabilities Removal Bill.—Petition from Edinburgh, against ; to lie upon the Table 1293

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Transvaal.—Copy presented, of Further Correspondence relating to the Transvaal Labour Importation Ordinance [by Command] ; to lie upon the Table 1293

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

NAVAL PENSIONS.—Question, Sir Carne Rasch (Essex, Chelmsford); Answer, Mr. Pretyman 1294

WILD BIRDS PROTECTION ACT—CLEARER NOTICES.—Question, Mr. Pirie (Aberdeen, N.); Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 1294

POSTMASTERSHIP OF KILRUSH—APPLICATIONS FROM MEMBERS OF IRISH POSTAL SERVICE.—Question, Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.); Answer, Lord Stanley 1294

BIDEFORD, WESTWARD HO AND APPLEDORE RAILWAY—LOOP ON THE QUAY ROAD, BIDEFORD.—Question, Mr. Soares (Devonshire, Barnstaple); Answer, Mr. Gerald Balfour 1295

NAVAL EXPENDITURE OF FRANCE, GERMANY AND RUSSIA.—Question, Mr. Runciman (Dewsbury); Answer, Mr. Pretyman 1295

SOMALILAND—COST OF MILITARY OPERATIONS PRIOR TO 1ST OCTOBER, 1902.—Mr. Lambert (Devonshire, South Molton); Answer, Earl Percy 1296

IMPERIAL DEFENCE ACT—EXPENDITURE FOR MILITARY PURPOSES.—Question, Mr. Runciman; Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1296

TIBETAN MISSION.—Question, Mr. Lambert; Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1296

INSPECTION OF THE RIVER BARROW.—Question, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1297

NEW BRIDGE AT WATERFORD—GOVERNMENT AND LOCAL CONTRIBUTIONS.—Question, Mr. William Moore (Antrim, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham .. 1279

IRISH AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT—DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS.—Question, Mr. William Moore; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1297

FIRST VOLUNTEER BATTALION ROYAL FUSILIERS (CADET BATTALION)—COURT OF INQUIRY.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1298

SALARIES AND COMMISSION OF CROWN AGENTS.—Question, Mr. Scott Montagu (Hampshire, New Forest); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 1298

MERCHANT SHIPPING (LIGHTHOUSES) BILL.—[SECOND READING.]—Order for Second Reading read.

Mr. Plummer (*Newcastle-on-Tyne*) 1299
Mr. Rea (*Gloucester*) 1304

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Sir Albert Rollit (*Islington, S.*) 1307
Mr. Joyce (*Limerick*) 1309
Mr. Gibson Bowles (*Lynn Regis*) 1311
Sir John Leng (*Dundee*) 1315
Mr. Hain (*Cornwall, St. Ives*) 1317

Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland) 1320
Mr. Austin Taylor (Liverpool, East Toxteth) 1324
Mr. J. F. Hope (Sheffield, Brightside) 1327
Mr. T. Harrington (Dublin Harbour) 1329
Mr. Ritchie (Croydon) 1330
Mr. Renwick (Newcastle-on-Tyne) 1332
Mr James Joicey (Durham, Chester-le-Street) 1335
Sir M. Hicks Beach (Bristol, W.) 1336
Mr. Charles McArthur (Liverpool Exchange) 1338
Major Jameson (Clare, W.) 1340
The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) 1344
Mr. David MacIver (Liverpool, Kirkdale) 1351
Mr. Malcolm (Suffolk, Stowmarket) 1352

The House divided :—Ayes, 155 ; Noes, 129. (Division List No. 124.)

Bill accordingly read a second time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be committed to the Standing Committee on Trade, etc."—(*Mr. Plummer.*)

And, it being alter half-past Five of the Clock, and objection being taken to Further Proceeding, the Debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed upon Friday, 3rd June.

Adjourned at twenty-four minutes before Six o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS: MONDAY, 16TH MAY, 1904.

SAT FIRST.—The Earl of Chichester sat first in Parliament after the death of his brother 1357

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with :
Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 1).

Also the Certificate that no Standing Orders are applicable to the following Bill :

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 3).

Also the Certificates that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with :—

Barnet District Gas and Water ; Crystal Palace District Gas.

And also the Certificate that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have not been complied with :—

Tottenham Improvement.

The same were ordered to lie on the Table 1357

May 16.] *Page*

Filey Improvement Bill [H.L.].—Reported with Amendments.. 1357

Great Western Railway Bill [H.L.].—The King's consent signified; and Bill reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments 1357

St. Marylebone Electric Lighting Bill.—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments 1357

Manchester Corporation Tramways Bill [H.L.].—A witness ordered to attend the Select Committee 1357

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill.—Read 2ª, and committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection 1357

Portmadoc, Beddgelert, and South Snowdon Railway Bill [H.L.].—Read 3ª. Amendments made. Bill passed, and sent to the Commons 1357

Preston Corporation Water Bill [H.L.]; Bournemouth Corporation (Tramways) Bill [H.L.]; Newcastle-upon-Tyne Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Alexandra (Newport and South Wales) Docks and Railway Bill [H.L.]; St. Mary Woolnoth Bill [H.L.]. Read 3ª, and passed, and sent to the Commons .. 1358

Croydon Gas Bill.—Read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons 1358

Canal Rates and Charges (Regent's Canal) Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill [H.L.]. To be read 2ª To-morrow 1358

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill.—Brought from the Commons; read 1ª; to be printed; and referred to the Examiners. (No. 78) 1358

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill [H.L.]. House in Committee (according to order). An Amendment made. Standing Committee negatived. The Report of Amendment to be received To-morrow 1358

Educational Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill [H.L.]. Read 3ª (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons 1358

Manchester Corporation (General Powers Bill [H.L.]; Manchester Corporation Tramways Bill [H.L.]. The order made on Tuesday the 26th of April last appointing certain Lords the Select Committee to consider the Bills, discharged 1358

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE.—Annual Statement of the Trade of the United Kingdom with Foreign Countries and British Possessions, 1903, compared with the four preceding years: Volume II. (Abstract and dealled tables of trade with each country and at each port). Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 1358

MEDWAY CONSERVANCY.—Statement of Receipts and Expenditure by the Conservators, for the year ended 25th March, 1904. Delivered (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 1359

NEW BILLS.

Re-Vaccination Bill [H.L.]. -A Bill to provide for the Re-vaccination of children after the age of twelve—Was presented by the Duke of Northumberland; read 1ª, and to be printed. (No. 77) 1359

Prize Courts Bill [H.L.].—House in Committee (according to order). Bill reported without Amendments, and re-committed to the Standing Committee 1359

Weights and Measures (Metric System) Bill [H.L.].—Amendments reported (according to order.)

Lord Belhaven and Stenton 1359

Amendments moved—

> " In Clause 3, page 2, line 15, to leave out the words ' be deemed to' ; in line 18, to leave out the words ' if not so made shall be void and ' ; in line 20, after the word ' system ' to insert the words ' and if any person makes or has any contract, bargain, sale, or dealing, or charges or collects any toil or duty contary to the provisions of this section, he shall. on conviction under the Summary Jurisdiction Acts' be liable for each offence to a fine not exceeding 40s. ' ; in line 24, to leave out the words ' render void ' and insert the words ' apply to ' ; and in line 25, to leave out from the word ' Kingdom ' to the word ' or ' in line 28, and to insert the words ' or in respect of any subject-matter outside the United Kingdom, or if any goods to be imported into or exported from the United Kingdom, if made or had according to the systems of weights and measures in force in the foreign country concerned."—(*Lord Belhaven and Stenton.*)

On Question, Amendments agreed to. Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow ; and to be printed as amended. (No. 79.)

House adjourned at twenty minutes before Five o'clock till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: MONDAY, 16TH MAY, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).—MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz. :—Marylebone Chapels (Saint James, Westmoreland Street) Bill [Lords] ; Minehead Urban District Council Water Bill [Lords] ; West Riding Tramways Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time 1360

May 16.] *Page*

Provisional Order Bills (No Standing Orders Applicable).—Mr. Speaker laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, referred on the First Reading thereof, no Standing Orders are applicable, viz. :—Land Drainage Provisional Order (Owston and West Butterwick, in county of Lincoln (Parts of Lindsey) Bill ; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill ; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 12) Bill.

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time To-morrow 1360

Provisional Order Bills (Standing Orders Applicable Thereto Complied with).—Mr. Speaker laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz. :—Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill ; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill ; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill ; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 13) Bill.

Ordered. That the Bills be read a second time To-morrow 1361

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway (Various Powers) Bill (King's Consent signified). Bill read the third time, and passed 1361

Harlow and Sawbridgeworth Gas Bill [Lords]; Nuneaton and Chilvers Coton Urban District Council Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered ; to be read the third time 1361

Chesterfield Gas and Water Board Bill [Lords]; Harrogate Waterworks Tramroad Bill [Lords]. Read a second time, and committed 1361

Leeds Corporation (Waterworks Railway Bill [Lords]; Llanelly Harbour Bill [Lords]. Read a second time, and committed 1361

Metropolitan District Railway Bill [Lords]; Neath, Pontardawe, and Brynaman Railway Bill [Lords] ; Shipley Urban District Council Bill [Lords] ; South Staffordshire Mines Drainage Bill [Lords]. Read a second time, and committed 1361

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill. Read a second time, and committed .. 1361

Local Government Provisional Order (No. 15); Bill to confirm a Provisional Order of the Local Government Board relating to Cardiff, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Grant Lawson and Mr. Walter Long.

Local Government Provisional Order (No. 15) Bill; "To confirm a Provisional Order of the Local Government Board relating to Cardiff," presented accordingly, and read the first time ; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 196.] 1361

Message from the Lords.—That they have agreed to—Metropolitan Police Provisional Order Bill without Amendment 1362

Whitby Gas Bill; Blyth and Cowpen Gas Bill, with Amendments 1362

May 16.] *Page*

PETITIONS.

LICENSING BILL.—Petitions against; from Lindal in Furness; Milnathort; Partick; Kirkby Muxloe; Westerhan; New Bury; Farnworth (four); Rinley; Derby; West Bromwich; Kincardine; Edinburgh (two); Warrington; North Shields; Glasgow (five); North Berwick; Cornsay; Esk; Beamish; Blackhill; Hamsteels; Langley Park; Bathgate; Sheffield (two); Wroughton Road; Lewes; Glastonbury; Liverpool; Cornsay Colliery; Langley Moor; Waterhouses; Beith; Hammersmith; Oxford; Bath; Bearpark; Gourock; Inverness; East Somerset; Holsworthy; Bainbridge; Stanwick; Northampton; Gowerton; Caersalem Newydd; Wannarewydd; Gurnos; Ynysmendw; Ystalyfera; Brynamman; Rotherham (two); Newcastle-on-Tyne; Hamilton; Marley Hill; Galashiels; Holloway; Alva; Eccles; Alloa; Milnathort; Southend; Newport; Wellington; Mere; Birstall; Reading; Thetford; Falmouth; Penryn; Paisley; Todmoden; Fraserburgh; Thornhill; Kirkpatrick Fleming (two); Kettering; Tiverton; Cranbourne; Dundee (four); Penrith; Malmesbury; Chippenham; Rye; Egremont; Sawtry; Caythorpe; Locharbriggs; Kinloch Laggan; Treboeth; Landore; Aberdeen; Canning Town; Burnley; Paisley; and Parkgate; to lie upon the Table 1362

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

LOCAL AUTHORITIES IN SCOTLAND (TECHNICAL EDUCATION).—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 26th June, 1903; *The Lord Advocate*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 117.] 1363

EASTERN MAIL SERVICE COMMITTEE.—Copy presented, of Report of the Eastern Mail Service Committee, 1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. 1363

TRADE (FOREIGN COUNTRIES AND BRITISH POSSESSIONS).—Copy presented, of Annual Statement of the Trade of the United Kingdom with Foreign Countries and British Possessions for 1903. Volume II. [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1363

PATENTS, DESIGNS, AND TRADE MARKS.—Copy presented, of Twenty-first Report of the Comptroller-General of Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks, with Appendices, for the year 1903 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 178.] 1363

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.—Medway Conservancy. Copy of Statement of Receipts and Expenditure of the Conservators for the year ending 25th March, 1904 [by Act] 1363

ALLOTMENTS (SCOTLAND).—Return ordered, "showing (1) the Proceedings of Parish Councils in regard to Allotments and Common Pasture under Section 26 of The Local Government (Scotland) Act, 1894; and (2) the Proceedings of County Councils in regard to representations by Parish Councils for Orders under the Local Government (Scotland) Act, 1894, Section 26, authorising land to be taken on lease compulsorily for Allotments since the date of the last Return on the 15th day of July last (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 257, of Session 1903)."—(*Mr. Eugene Wason.*) .. 1363

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

WATER SUPPLY OF ERBUSAIG SCHOOL.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 1364

May 16.] *Page*

CONSTRUCTION OF HARBOUR AT AVOCH, ROSS-SHIRE—GOVERNMENT GRANT.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 1364

PUBLICATION OF REPORT OF FISHERY BOARD FOR SCOTLAND.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. A. Graham Murray 1364

REFUSAL TO READ BURIAL SERVICE BY VICAR OF LITTLE CANFIELD, ESSEX.—Question, Mr. J. A. Pease (Essex, Saffron Walden); Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 1365

PROPOSAL OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE BARONETAGE.—Question, Sir John Dorington (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury); Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 1365

INSANITARY CONDITION OF THE RIVER RAY.—Question, Sir F. Dixon-Hartland (Middlesex, Uxbridge); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 1366

NURSING OF SICK POOR IN WORKHOUSES—RECOMMENDATIONS OF COMMITTEE.—Question, Sir Harry Samuel (Tower Hamlets, Limehouse); Answer, Mr. Walter Long 1366

POSTAL FACILITIES AT LEAMYGLISSANE AND CUMMEEN.—Question, Mr. Murphy (Kerry, E.); Answer, Lord Stanley 1366

EXTENSION OF TRUNK TELEPHONE SYSTEM TO TRALEE.—Question, Mr. Thomas O'Donnell (Kerry, W.); Answer, Lord Stanley 1367

DELAYS IN LONDON AND BRIGHTON TELEPHONE SERVICE.—Question, Mr. Loder (Brighton); Answer, Lord Stanley 1367

CORK POST OFFICE—QUALIFICATIONS OF OFFICER SELECTED AS CLERK.—Questions, Mr. J. F. X. O'Brien (Cork); Answers, Lord Stanley 1368

GERMAN BATTLESHIP BUILDING PROGRAMME.—Question, Sir John Colomb (Great Yarmouth); Answer, Mr. Pretyman 1369

THE BRITISH AND GERMAN NAVIES.—Question, Mr. Yerburgh (Chester); Answer, Mr. Pretyman 1370

RAILWAY CARRIAGE ON GRAIN, POTATOES, ETC., IN SCOTLAND.—Question, Mr. Buchanan (Perthshire, E.); Answer, Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes 1370

POSITION OF CLERKS TO SURVEYORS OF TAXES.—Question, Mr. Nannetti (Dublin, College Green); Answer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 1371

RE-ORGANISATION OF INDIAN ARMY—LORD KITCHENER'S MEMORANDUM.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1371

ESTIMATED INCREASED ANNUAL COST OF INDIAN POLICE SERVICE.—Question, Mr. Herbert Roberts (Denbighshire, W.); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1372

TEACHERS AS SECRETARIES TO SCHOOL ATTENDANCE COMMITTEES.—Question, Mr. Thomas O'Donnell; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1372

CLERKS IN IRISH COUNTY SURVEYOR'S AND COUNTY SECRETARY'S OFFICES.—Question, Mr. Thomas O'Donnell; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1372

May 16.] **Page**

IRISH LAND COMMISSION.—Question, Mr. Flynn (Cork Co., N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1373

EXTRA POLICE CHARGES REMITTED IN GALWAY.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1374

POISONING OF FISH IN RIVER LEE BY OUTFLOW FROM ROYAL GUNPOWDER FACTORY.—Question, Colonel Lockwood (Essex, Epping); Answer, Mr. Arnold-Forster 1374

THE CROWN AGENTS.—Question, Mr. Herbert Samuel (Yorkshire, Cleveland); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 1375

SALARIES AND COMMISSION OF CROWN AGENTS.—Question, Mr. Scott Montagu (Hampshire, New Forest); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 1375

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE

BRITISH AND FOREIGN BATTLESHIP CONSTRUCTION.—Question, Mr. Yerburgh (Chester); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Pretyman, Suffolk, Woodbridge, ... 1376

BATTLESHIP LIFE LIMITS.—Question, Mr. Yerburgh; Answer, Mr. Pretyman .. 1376

NORTH OF SCOTLAND FISHERIES—PREVENTION OF ILLEGAL TRAWLING.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Mr. Pretyman 1377

MORTALITY AMONG THE NATIVES IN THE TRANSVAAL MINES.—Question, Mr. Herbert Samuel (Yorkshire, Cleveland); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Lyttelton, Warwick and Leamington) 1377

MINE DOCTOR'S REPORT ON DISEASES AMONG NATIVES ON THE RAND.—Question, Mr. Herbert Samuel; Answer, Mr. Lyttelton 1378

CHINESE LABOUR IN THE TRANSVAAL—COMMISSARIAT ARRANGEMENTS.—Question, Mr. Duncan (Yorkshire, W.R., Otley); Answer, Mr. Lyttelton .. 1378

THE TIBETAN MISSION—ADVANCE TO LHASA.—Questions, Mr. Trevelyan (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland), Mr. Flynn (Cork County, N.), and Mr. Gibson Bowles (Lynn Regis); Answers, The Secretary of State for India (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford) 1378

STRENGTH OF THE TIBETAN EXPEDITION.—Question, Mr. Lambert (Devonshire, South Molton); Answer, Mr. Brodrick 1379

DATE OF ADVANCE TO LHASA—CHINESE SUZERAINTY TO TIBET.—Questions, Mr. Lambert and Mr. Sydney Buxton (Tower Hamlets, Poplar); Answers, Mr. Brodrick 1380

SMOKE NUISANCE—FOREIGN LEGISLATION.—Question, Mr. Bryce (Aberdeen, S.); Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Earl Percy, Kensington, S.) 1380

CHINESE WAR INDEMNITY.—Question, Mr. McCrae (Edinburgh, E.); Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.) 1381

May 16.] *Page*

EASTERN MAIL SERVICE COMMITTEE'S REPORT.—Question, Mr. Evelyn Cecil (Aston Manor); Answer, The Postmaster General (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton) 1381

THE WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT, 1897—PROPOSED AMENDMENT.—Question, Mr. Samuel Evans (Glamorganshire, Mid.); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Akers Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's) 1382

GAMBLING PROSECUTIONS.—Question, Mr. Mansfield (Lincolnshire, Spalding); Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 1382

SCIENTIFIC RESULTS OF VIVISECTION.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 1382

VEHICULAR TRAFFIC REGULATIONS IN THE METROPOLIS.—Question, Mr. Causton (Southwark, N.); Answer, Mr. Akers Douglas 1383

TEACHERS ON EDUCATION AUTHORITIES.—Question, Mr. Mansfield; Answer, The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education (Sir William Anson, Oxford University) 1383

LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL EDUCATION COMMITTEE AND THE PRESS.—Question, Mr. Atherley Jones (Durham, N.W.); Answer, Sir William Anson .. 1384

ST. JAMES'S PARK PATHS.—Question, Captain Norton (Newington, W.); Answer, Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley) 1384

CAHIRCIVEEN ESTUARY—BUOYS.—Questions, Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.), Mr. Joyce (Limerick), and Mr. Flynn; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Wyndham, Dover) 1384

GRANARD WORKHOUSE MASTER.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1385

DUNDRUM ESTATE, COUNTY TIPPERARY.—Question, Mr. Kendal O'Brien (Tipperary, Mid.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1386

BALLINASLOE ASYLUM—DR. KIRWAN'S APPOINTMENT.—Question, Mr. Roche (Galway, E.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1386

LOUGH NEAGH DRAINAGE.—Question, Mr. Charles Craig (Antrim, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1387

COLLEGE OF SCIENCE, DUBLIN—APPOINTMENT OF ARCHITECT.—Question, Mr. Mooney (Dublin County, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1387

BICYCLE THEFTS IN DUBLIN.—Question, Mr. Mooney; Answer, Mr. Wyndham .. 1388

LABOURERS' COTTAGES (IRELAND) RETURN.—Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy (Limerick, W.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1388

RE-INSTATEMENT OF EVICTED TENANTS.—Questions, Mr. Murphy (Kerry, E.); Answers, Mr. Wyndham 1389

TREDENNICK ESTATE, COUNTY ROSCOMMON.—Question, Mr. Hayden (Roscommon, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1389

May 16.] *Page*

BELCOO POLICE FORCE.—Question, Mr. Jordan (Fermanagh, S.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1390

RELIGIOUS NOMENCLATURE—"CATHOLIC" OR ROMAN CATHOLIC.—Questions, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory) and Mr. John Redmond (Waterford); Answers, Mr. Speaker 1391

CASE OF MICHAEL CURTIN.—Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy; Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1392

BANBRIDGE DISTURBANCES.—Questions, Mr. Sloan and Mr. Flavin (Kerry, N.); Answers, Mr. Wyndham 1392

PRICE ASKED FOR LAND BY TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN.—Questions, Mr. Flavin and Mr. T. W. Russell (Tyrone, S.); Answers, Mr. Wyndham .. 1394

BORRISOLEIGH BAND AND THE POLICE.—Question, Mr. P. J. O'Brien (Tipperary, N.); Answer, Mr. Wyndham 1394

SANITARY ACCOMMODATION IN NORTH OF IRELAND TRAINS.—Question, Mr. Jordan (Fermanagh, S.); Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central) 1395

IRISH TELEGRAPH SERVICE—CASE OF MARK FINNERTY.—Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy; Answer, Lord Stanley 1396

IRISH TELEGRAPHS—CLONES LIMITED COMPETITION.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Lord Stanley 1396

BANK OF IRELAND—ADVANCES TO THE GOVERNMENT DURING SOUTH AFRICAN WAR.—Questions, Mr. John Redmond; Answers, Mr. Austen Chamberlain 1396

CERTIFICATION OF DEATH IN THE HIGHLANDS.—Questions, Mr. Weir; Answer, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.) 1397

TUBERCULOSIS INQUIRY.—Question, Mr. Channing (Northamptonshire, E.); Answer, Mr. A. J. Balfour 1398

MONUMENT TO THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY.—Committee to consider an Address to His Majesty, praying that His Majesty will give directions that a Monument be erected at the Public Charge in the Collegiate Church of St. Peter, Westminster, to the memory of the late right hon. the Marquess of Salisbury; to-morrow.—(*Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) 1398

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).—Mr. HALSEY reported from the Committee of Selection, That they had discharged the following Member from the Standing Committee on Law, and Courts of Justice, and Legal Procedure: Mr. Attorney-General; and had appointed in substitution: Mr. Solicitor-General.

Report to lie upon the Table 1399

Bishoprics of Southwark and Birmingham Bill.—Reported without Amendment, from the Standing Committee on Law, etc.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 179.]

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 179.]

Bill to be taken into consideration to-morrow 1399

STANDING COMMITTEES (CHAIRMEN'S PANEL).—Sir JAMES FERGUSSON reported from the Chairmen's Panel, That they had appointed Sir James Fergusson to act as Chairman of the Standing Committee for the consideration of Bills relating to Law, and Courts of Justice, and Legal Procedure, in the place of Mr. Laurence Hardy.

Sir JAMES FERGUSSON further reported, That they had appointed Mr. John Edward Ellis to act as Chairman of the Standing Committee for the consideration of Bills relating to Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufactures, in the place of Mr. Stuart-Wortley.

Reports to lie upon the Table 1399

NEW BILL.

Solicitors Bill.—" To apply Section 16 of The Solicitors Act, 1888, to Solicitors who are undischarged bankrupts," presented by Mr. Attorney-General; supported by Mr. Solicitor-General; to be read a second time upon Tuesday, 31st May, and to be printed. [Bill 197] 1400

Finance Bill.—[SECOND READING].—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That the Bill be now read a second time."

Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman (Stirling Burghs) 1400

Amendment proposed—

" To leave out from the word ' That ' to the end of the Question, in order to add the words ' this House, having regard to the heavy burden of taxation proposed by this Bill in a time of peace, deems it necessary to declare its condemnation of the large and continuous increase of the national expenditure in recent years.' "—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

Question proposed, " That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Victor Cavendish, Derbyshire, W.) 1412
Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) 1418
Mr. Hayes Fisher (Fulham) 1427

May 16.] *Page*

Mr. McCrae (Edinburgh, E.) 1432
Mr. Beckett (Yorkshire, N.R., Whitby) 1441
Sir Brampton Gurdon (Norfolk, N.) 1446
Sir George Bartley (Islington, N.) 1450
Mr. Edmund Robertson (Dundee) 1456
Mr. H. C. Richards (Finsbury, E.) 1460

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the debate stood adjourned until this Evening's Sitting.

EVENING SITTING.

Gosport Water Bill [Lords] (By Order).—A verbal Amendment made; Bill read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 1463

Finance Bill—[Second Reading.]—Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on Amendment to Question [16th May], "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Which Amendment was—

> "To leave out from the word 'That,' to the end of the Question, in order to add the words 'this House, having regard to the heavy burden of taxation proposed by this Bill in a time of peace, deems it necessary to declare its condemnation of the large and continuous increase of the national expenditure in recent years.'"—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. Joseph Walton (Yorkshire, W.R., Barnsley) 1464
Sir Frederick Banbury (Camberwell, Peckham) 1470
Mr. Buchanan (Perthshire, E.) 1473
Mr. Winston Churchill (Oldham) 1479
Mr. Renwick (Newcastle-on-Tyne) 1489
Mr. Theodore Taylor (Lancashire, Radcliffe) 1490

Motion made, and Question, "That the debate be now adjourned."—(*Lord Alwyne Compton*)—put, and agreed to.

Debate to be resumed to-morrow.

Adjourned at nine minutes after Twelve o'clock.

End of Table of Contents to Vol. CXXXIV

THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(*AUTHORISED EDITION*)

IN THE

FIFTH SESSION OF THE *TWENTY-SEVENTH PARLIAMENT* OF THE
UNITED KINGDOM OF *GREAT BRITAIN* AND *IRELAND*, IN THE
FOURTH YEAR OF THE REIGN OF

HIS MAJESTY KING EDWARD VII.

SIXTH VOLUME OF SESSION.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Friday, 29*th April*, 1904.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with:—London County Council (Money); Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London) [H.L.].

Also the Certificate that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have not been complied with:—City of London (Central Criminal Court House).

And also the Certificate that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with:—Amersham, Beaconsfield, and District Water.

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

Newcastle and Gateshead Water Bill [H.L.]. A witness ordered to attend the Select Committee.

City of London (Central Criminal Court House) Bill. Examiners' Certificate of non-compliance with the Standing Orders referred to the Standing Orders Committee on Thursday next.

Harrogate Waterworks Tramroad Bill [H.L.]. Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

Leeds Corporation (Waterworks) Railway Bill [H.L.]. Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

Cardiff Railway Bill [H.L.]. Report from the Select Committee, That the Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the Bill, the opposition thereto having been withdrawn; read, and ordered to lie on the Table. The orders made on the 19th of February and 24th of March last discharged, and Bill committed.

Manchester Ship Canal (Finance) Bill [H.L.]; Ebbw Vale Urban District Water Bill [H.L.]; Shipley Urban District Council Bill [H.L.]. Read 3^{a}, and passed, and sent to the Commons.

Great Northern and City Railway (Extension of Time) Bill; Corbridge Gas Bill. Read 3^{a}, and passed.

Hampton-in-Arden Gas Bill. Read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

Local Government Provisional Order (Poor Law) Bill. Brought from the Commons; read 1ª; to be printed; and referred to the Examiners. (No. 59.)

Great Yarmouth Corporation Bill [H.L.]. Report from the Select Committee, That the Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the Bill, no parties having appeared in opposition thereto; read, and ordered to lie on the Table. The orders made on the 11th of March and Friday last discharged, and Bill committed.

Mullingar, Kells, and Drogheda Railway Bill; Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Bill. Brought from the Commons; read 1ª; and referred to the Examiners.

Neath, Pontardawe, and Brynaman Railway Bill [H.L.]. Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (Birmingham) Bill [H.L.]. A Bill to confirm a Provisional Order made by the Board of Education under the Education Acts, 1870 to 1903, to enable the Council of the City and County Borough of Birmingham to put in force the Lands Clauses Acts, was presented by the Earl of Onslow (for the Lord President (E. Vane [M. Londonderry])); read 1ª; to be printed; and referred to the Examiners. (No. 56.)

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill [H.L.]. (No. 57.) A Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Electric Lighting Acts, 1882 and 1888, relating to Ashford (Kent), Ely, Ham, Hexham, Horley, Keynsham (Somerset), Kingswood, Newton Abbot (Extension), Teignmouth (Amendment), and Walton-upon-Thames; and

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill [H.L.]. (No. 58.) A Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Electric Lighting Acts, 1882 and 1888, the Electric Lighting (Scotland Act), 1890, and the Electric Lighting (Scotland) Act, 1902, relating to Musselburgh, Portpatrick, and Wishaw.

Were presented by the Earl Waldegrave (for the Lord Wolverton); read 1ª; to be printed; and referred to the Examiners.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

NAVY (HYDROGRAPHER'S REPORT).

Report on Admiralty Surveys for the year 1903, by the Hydrographer.

HISTORICAL MANUSCRIPTS (ROYAL COMMISSION).

Calendar of the manuscripts of the most hon. the Marquess of Salisbury, preserved at Hatfield House, Hertfordshire. Part X.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

ROYAL PARKS AND GARDENS.

Rules in connection with the regulations prescribed by "The Parks Regulation Act, 1872."

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (IRELAND).

Order with respect to the urban county district of Enniskillen.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

UNIVERSITIES OF OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE ACT, 1877.

Statutes made by the Governing Body of Trinity College, Cambridge, on the 7th December, 1903, amending Statutes XXVIII., XXIX., XXXI., XLI., XLII., XLIX., LIV., and LXI. of the Statutes of the College.

Statutes made by the Governing Body of the Brasenose College, Oxford, on the 9th December, 1903, amending Statutes II., III., IV., V., X., XII., XIII., XV., XVI., and XVII. of the Statutes of the College.

Statutes made by the Governing Body of Balliol College, Oxford, on the 15th December, 1903, amending Statute V., Clause 3 (A) of the Statutes of the College.

Laid before the House (pursuant to the Act), and to be printed. (No. 55.)

SALVAGE CLAIMS AGAINST VESSELS OF THE CROWN.

Lord MUSKERRY: My Lords, I rise to call attention to the decision in August last of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council regarding the action by the owners of the British steamer "Furnessia" for salvage for services rendered to the steamer "Scotia," belonging to the Canadian Government, and to ask whether the Canadian Government have now made adequate compensation *ex gratia* to both owners and crew of the "Furnessia," and, if not, whether, in view of the important public principle involved, His Majesty's Government will make representations to the Government of Canada and urge the desirability of their granting such compensation.

This important matter is one of much simplicity. To put it shortly, it is a case where no question is raised as to the great value of the services rendered by one vessel to another in serious danger. The vessel saved from her perilous situation, the "Scotia," proves, however, to be the property of the Canadian Government. As belonging, therefore, to the Crown, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council have upheld the decision of the Supreme Court of Newfoundland, that no action for salvage lies with the owners of the steamer "Furnessia." Consequently, if the matter rests where it did, neither owners nor crew of this steamer will receive any recompense for the labour or the grave responsibilities which were undertaken, and which were of such value to the Canadian Government. So far as I am able to judge as a layman, the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council is a perfectly proper one; but though it is based in strict accordance with the law I am exceedingly glad to find their very decided views that the owners and crew of the "Furnessia" have an unanswerable moral claim for the services they rendered. I will take the liberty of quoting from the decision of the Supreme Court of Newfoundland on this case. They said—

"We have no doubt that the services rendered by the plaintiff vessel "Furnessia" to the defendant "Scotia," belonging to the Government of Canada, were of a meritorious character and worthy of recompense upon as liberal a scale as could be awarded by this Court in the event of its being subsequently held that the plaintiff is entitled to recover against the defendant ship in this action. The "Scotia" was undoubtedly in an extremely dangerous position at the time the "Furnessia" came up with her. She would have become unmanageable when her fuel for steering purpose was exhausted. She was short of provisions and was on the northern edge of the northern lane of ocean traffic, and must have soon drifted, with the then prevailing winds, further to the North, when her chances of assistance would become therefore less and less daily. The services rendered were timely, and, though not performed with extra hazardous risk to life or property, there was considerable risk and danger—first in getting the towing hawser on board by the officer and crew of the 'Furnessia,' and subsequently in the performance of the work of towing."

The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in giving judgment on the appeal from the decision of the Supreme Court of Newfoundland, said—

"We cannot forbear from expressing our hearty concurrence with the view of the Supreme Court as to the meritorious nature of the services rendered. If, therefore, the refusal to make compensation is insisted on—properly enough insisted on, in the first instance, as a matter of right against the Crown—and if it comes to be thought that the Government will not feel called upon to pay compensation in any circumstances, not even in such circumstances as the present (in which their Lordships are sure that a foreign Government would feel called upon to pay compensation), what will be the result? The result would be to warn everybody not to assist a ship belonging to His Majesty in however great distress she might be, and thereby incur any risk, because any claim for services would be met by the technical objection that no one is entitled, as a matter of right, to recover salvage from the Crown. Their Lordships state that they would deeply lament to learn that the Canadian Government, when the circumstances are brought to their attention, refuse to give effect to the hearty recommendation of the Court below, which their Lordships desire emphatically to endorse and to repeat."

I feel that your Lordships will heartily concur with the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council that if assistance on the high seas to one of His Majesty's ships does not meet with the reward it deserves, it is calculated to lead to very serious consequences. In view of the strong utterances of the Judicial Committee, I hope to hear that the Canadian Government have now made due compensation, and, if not, I trust that your Lordships will agree with me as to the desirability of His Majesty's Government officially interceding on behalf of the owners and crew of the "Furnessia." In conclusion, I may say that I am drawing the attention of your Lordships to this matter because of the important principle involved in it. Services rendered to ships of the Crown in peril should be properly recognised, otherwise they are not likely to be so readily given in future.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (The Duke of MARLBOROUGH): My Lords, the noble Lord has given a fairly accurate history of the incidents in connection with the steamer "Furnessia" and the steamer "Scotia" and has reminded us that the "Furnessia" did signal service in saving the "Scotia" from wreck. In fact, to quote the words of the Judges of the Supreme Court, the "Scotia" was rescued by the "Furnessia" from a plight than which nothing could be more pitiable. The matter for salvage, as the noble Lord has pointed out, was referred to the Judges of the Supreme Court in Newfoundland, and in giving their decision they pointed out that if it had been a case between one owner of a ship and another owner there would have been no doubt considerable reason for giving salvage. But the Canadian Government intervened and pointed out that the ship belonged to the Crown—in other words, to the Canadian Government—and that it was impossible to proceed against the Crown for the purpose of recovering salvage. As the noble Lord has reminded the House, this question eventually came before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, over which the noble and learned Earl on the Woolsack presides. The Judicial Committee, so far as I understand it, had two points to decide. In the first place, they had to decide whether the ship in question belonged to the Crown—that is, to the Canadian Government; and, secondly, whether salvage could be legally enforced against the Crown. The Judicial Committee had no difficulty in deciding that the "Scotia" did undoubtedly belong to the Crown, in spite of certain technical objections which were raised—it was claimed that the ship had not then been handed over to the Canadian Government—and they regarded the Crown's immunity at law as a proposition which admitted of no doubt and was beyond the range of argument.

The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, having established the legality of the Canadian Government's position, drew the attention of that Government to the result which might follow if they refused to pay salvage. The noble Lord dwelt upon that point, and expressed himself as thoroughly agreeing with the views held by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. The decision of that Committee was given in July last, and the contents were duly sent to the Canadian Government. I am sorry to inform the noble Lord who has brought forward this question that the Colonial Office has received no communication from the Canadian Government as to their attitude with regard to this question. The Secretary of State has received no communication from the Governor-General, nor do we know the attitude that the Canadian Government have adopted with regard to the subject. As to the question put by the noble Lord, whether, in view of the important public principle involved, His Majesty's Government will make representations to the Canadian Government and urge the desirability of their granting such compensation, the Secretary of State has authorised me to say that he will cause a communication to be addressed to the Governor-General of Canada, but I fear that that communication will not be couched in exactly the terms which the noble Lord has suggested. The Secretary of State will inquire from the Governor-General whether the Canadian Government have come to any decision upon this matter—it may have been already decided, for all we know—and whether, if they have not decided it, they will give it their serious consideration, and whether they feel disposed to grant any compensation to the owners and crew of the ship in question. Until we receive further information from the Canadian Government I think the noble Lord will agree that it would be premature for us to form any opinion as to the course of action by which the Canadian Government are likely to be guided in the consideration of this matter.

House adjourned at a quarter before Five o'clock to Monday next, a quarter before Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 29th April, 1904.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [Lords] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. Speaker laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz.:—Preston and Blackburn Tramways Bill [Lords]. Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time.

PRIVATE BILL PETITIONS (STANDING ORDERS NOT COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. Speaker laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the Petition for the following Bill, the Standing Orders have not been complied with, viz. :—City of London (Central Criminal Court House). Ordered, That the Report be referred to the Select Committee on Standing Orders.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. Speaker laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz. :—Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill. Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time upon Monday next.

Great Central Railway Bill (King's Consent signified). Bill read the third time, and passed.

Harrow Road and Paddington Tramways Bill; Humber Commercial Railway and Dock Bill. Read the third time, and passed.

Barnet District Gas and Water Bill; Donegal Railway Bill; Ipswich Dock Commission Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

Weston-super-Mare Grand Pier Bill [Lords] (by Order). Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment.

Crystal Palace District Gas Bill; Tottenham Improvement Bill; Gosport Water Bill [Lords]; Metropolitan Railway Bill [Lords]. Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

West Metropolitan Railway (Abandonment) Bill [Lords]. Reported, with an Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Victoria University of Manchester Bill [Lords]. Reported, without Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill. Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time upon Monday next.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled "An Act to confer further powers upon the Lancashire Electric Power Company; and for other purposes." [Lancashire Electric Power Bill [Lords.]

Lancashire Electric Power Bill [Lords], read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Stornaway, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Dundee, in favour: to lie upon the Table.

LAND VALUES TAXATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Lanark, in favour, to lie upon the Table.

LICENCES (RENEWAL).

Petitions against alteration of Law; from Oldham; Southampton; Shirley; Lewes (two); Kensington; West Ealing; Felling on Tyne; Hackney; and Strood; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petition from Deeside, against; to lie upon the Table.

RAILWAYS (PRIVATE SIDINGS) BILL.

Petition from Birmingham, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RATING OF MACHINERY BILL.

Petition from Leicestershire, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF BUTTER BILL.

Petition from Sheffield, against; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

LABOURERS' COTTAGES (IRELAND).

Returns [presented 28th April] to be printed. [No. 148.]

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Order of the Local Government Board for Ireland with respect to the Urban County District of Enniskillen [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

ROYAL PARKS AND GARDENS.

Copy presented, of Rules for the Royal Parks and Gardens in connection with the Regulations prescribed by The Parks Regulation Act, 1872 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

UNIVERSITIES OF OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE ACT, 1877 (CAMBRIDGE).

Copy presented, of Statutes made by the Governing Body of Trinity College, Cambridge, on 7th December 1903, amending Statutes XXVIII., XXIX., XXXI., XLI. XLII., XLIX., LIV., and LXI. of the College Statutes [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 149.]

UNIVERSITIES OF OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE ACT, 1877 (OXFORD).

Copy presented, of Statutes made by the Governing Body of Brasenose College, Oxford, on 9th December, 1903, amending Statutes II., III., IV., V., X., XII., XIII., XV., XVI., and XVII. of the College Statutes [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 150.]

UNIVERSITIES OF OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE ACT, 1877 (OXFORD).

Copy presented, of Statute made by the Governing Body of Balliol College, Oxford, on 15th December, 1903, amending Statute V., Clause 3 (a), of the Statutes of the College [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 151.]

HISTORICAL MANUSCRIPTS (ROYAL COMMISSION).

Copy presented, of Calendar of the Manuscripts of the most hon. the Marquess of Salisbury, preserved at Hatfield House, Hertfordshire. Part X. [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

NAVY (HYDROGRAPHER'S REPORT).

Copy presented, of Report on Admiralty Surveys for the year 1903 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Grievances of Irish Poor Law Medical Officers.

DR. THOMPSON (Monaghan, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if his attention has been called to the Report of the Special Commissioner of the British Medical Association, who has recently inquired into the grievances of the Irish Poor Law medical officers; and if, considering the allegations contained in the Report against the whole administration of the Poor Law medical service, he will recommend the appointment of a Royal Commission to investigate the whole question.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The recommendations contained in the Report referred to, even if they were practicable could only be carried out at an increased cost to the ratepayers together with a further large subsidy from public funds. The views of the Local Government Board on the question of the Poor Law medical service have been fully set out in its recently published annual Report, and it is not considered that any new facts would be ascertained by an investigation of the character suggested.

Arrest of Private Churchill, 1st Dragoon Guards.

SIR THOMAS ROE (Derby): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been drawn to the wrongful arrest on the 23rd April, and imprisonment as a deserter, of Private James Churchill, 1st Dragoon Guards, of Walker Lane, Derby; and, if so, whether any steps have been or will be taken to compensate Churchill for this action by the military authorities.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) No report of this occurrence has reached the War Office.

Licensing Bill — Quarter Sessional Divisions.

DR. HUTCHINSON (Sussex, Rye): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he will state the number of quarter sessional divisions in England and Wales under the new Licensing Bill.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) The number of quarter sessional areas under the Bill, as at present drawn, is about 130, including some seventy county boroughs.

Deaths from Burns Caused by Open Grates.

MR. ARTHUR HENDERSON (Durham, Barnard Castle): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he will give a Return of the number of deaths in the United Kingdom during 1903 certified by coroners as having resulted from burns caused by the igniting of clothing through open fire grates, under five years of age, over five years and under ten years, and over ten years of age respectively.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) I will consider whether a Return such as the hon. Member desires can be given. It could be prepared only from information supplied by the coroners, and I am now in communication with the Coroners' Society as to the details which it would be possible to procure and the best form for the purpose. Any Return which I could grant would relate only to England and Wales.

Aliens in British Prisons.

SIR THOMAS DEWAR (Tower Hamlets, St. George's): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he will state the number of aliens at present undergoing sentences in His Majesty's prisons in the United Kingdom.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) The Prison Commissioners, at my request, made inquiry as to the persons in custody in the prisons of England and Wales on the 23rd instant, and report that so far as they can ascertain the number of aliens, *i.e.*, persons declaring themselves to have been born abroad, was 635.

Disposal of Money found on Post Office Counters.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): To ask the Postmaster-General if he is aware that it is the practice of the police authorities in Scotland, in regard to finds of money which are not claimed, to deduct the cost of advertising and to hand the remainder back to the finder after the lapse of one year; and will he consider the advisability of adopting a similar course in regard to money found on post office counters instead of, as in the recent case at the Stock Exchange branch of the Glasgow post office, handing over two-thirds of the money found to the Department.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) The practice adopted in the post office was prescribed after careful consideration, and after legal advice had been taken. I see no sufficient reason for altering it.

Extension of Telephone System in Ireland.

MR. O'DOHERTY (Donegal, N.): To ask the Postmaster-General if he will state what is the delay in having the trunk telephone system extended from Ballymena to Londonderry and Limavady; and whether he will see that the work is proceeded with forthwith.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) The original proposal for the extension to Londonderry of the existing trunk line between Belfast and Ballymena would not, it appears, be sufficient to meet the demands which have now arisen. It is necessary, therefore, to prepare a more comprehensive scheme, and estimates are being obtained for this purpose. I hope it will be possible to announce the result in a short time.

Buncrana and Carndonagh Railway—Appointment of Arbitrators.

Mr. O'DOHERTY : To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to the fact that the Donegal County Council have applied to the Board of Trade for the appointment of arbitrators under the Tramways (Ireland) Act, 1883, in order to ascertain the surplus profits after providing for working expenses since the opening of the Buncrana to Carndonagh Railway ; and, if so, will he state what has been the cause of the delay in appointing the said arbitrators.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) Arbitrators for the purposes of the Londonderry and Lough Swilly (Carndonagh Extension) Railway Order, 1898, were appointed on the 1st February last, and the solicitors to the Donegal County Council were informed of the appointment on the same day.

Irish Board of Works.

Sir THOMAS ESMONDE (Wexford, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the Act under which the Board of Works (Ireland) was established, and if he will give the dates of any other Acts affecting the constitution or the powers of the Board; and if he will state how much money has been spent in Ireland by the Board of Works since its inception, and how much has been advanced through it by way of loans in Ireland.

(*Answered by Mr. Victor Cavendish.*) The Board of Works (Ireland) was established by the Act 1 and 2 Will. 4, c. 33. The later Acts affecting the constitution or powers of the Board are numerous and cannot conveniently be set out in an Answer to a Question. It would take a considerable time to work out the figures of expenditure requested. The loans advanced by the Board to the 31st March, 1904, reached a total of £45,825,781 6s. 8d., so far as the accounts have been provisionally summarised.

Irish Fisheries—Close Season and District.

Mr. O'DOHERTY : To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the fact that a by-law was promulgated last year by the Fisheries Department of the Board of Agriculture in Ireland, prohibiting the fishing of herring off certain portions of the Donegal coast until the 1st May in every year, and that over thirty English and Scotch steam drifters have been for the past few weeks fishing in the prohibited grounds to the detriment of the local fishermen ; and, if so, whether in future he will take steps to have the by-law so extended as to include the remaining parts of the coasts of Donegal and Londonderry.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) Several prosecutions are pending for infringements of the by-law. The question of the desirability of extending the area affected by it is at present under consideration.

Militia and Volunteers—Report of Commission—Government's Decision.

Mr. REGINALD LUCAS (Portsmouth): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether the forthcoming Report of the Commission on Militia and Volunteers will be followed by immediate decision and action on the part of His Majesty's Government; and whether he can give any intimation of the approximate time when such decision will be announced.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) Until I am aware of the nature of the recommendations contained in the forthcoming Report of this Commission I cannot state whether any such immediate decision and action as are suggested in the Question can be taken with any practical result. My hon. friend may rest assured that no time will be lost in considering the Report and in announcing the action which the Government would propose to take.

Report of New South Wales Commission on the Decline of the Birth Rate.

Mr. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he will place a copy of the Report of the Royal Commission which has lately inquired into the decline of the birth rate in New South Wales in the Library, or in some other way make the Report available to Members.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*) I have not yet received a copy of the Report to which the hon. Member refers; but I have asked for copies, and I will place one in the Library as soon as copies arrive.

Immigrants into Canada.

Mr. D. A. THOMAS: To ask the Secretary of state for the Colonies if he can now state the number of immigrants into Canada for settlement during the year ending 30th June, 1903, distinguishing their nationality.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*) The number of immigrants reported to have declared their intention of settling in Canada during the year ended the 30th June, 1903, was as follows:—British,—English and Welsh, 32,510; Scotch, 7,046; Irish, 2,236; total, 41,792. Continental, etc.,—Galicians, 10,141; Germans, 1,887; Hungarians, 2,156; Austrians, 798; Scandinavians, 5,448; French and Belgians, 1,240; Russians and Finns, 7,277; Miscellaneous, 8,152; total, 37,099. United States, 49,473; grand total, 128,364.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

[Second Reading.]

Order for Second Reading read.

Mr. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick) said that judging from the sparse attendance of the jury—otherwise the Conservative and Liberal Members, whose votes and not Irish opinion would decide the issue—it might be imagined that this Bill was unimportant. But such was not the case, notwithstanding the absence of those who were expected and elected to take an interest in the maintenance of constitutional principles. Generally speaking in Party Governments power alone was respected, principles were upheld to-day and discarded to-morrow just as it suited the occasion. The provision of the Act which the Irish Party sought to-day to repeal might be regarded as the latest pocket edition of the penal laws up to date, ensuring the political disqualification of popular Irishmen from sitting on local councils. This exceptional law they intended to erase from the Statute-book, as it was diametrically opposed to constitutional usage, for in all constitutionally governed countries the rulers were governed by the people and subjected to popular control. Every student of history knew that it was by technical treason and open revolt that liberty was won, by breaking despotic laws whether imposed by a dominant minority—through Parliamentary agency—or by an aristocracy, oligarchy, or monarchy. This was what the men who were disqualified had been doing in Ireland. He therefore trusted that the House, and especially those entrusted with the responsible task of governing Ireland—those gentlemen on the Front Bench, who were instigated and assisted by Dublin Castle officials who practically governed Ireland—would take a broad, statesmanlike view of this reasonable demand, which was free from passion, prejudice, or Party pressure. This was the spirit in which he proposed to argue this subject from a constitutional standpoint. In refutation of exploded coercive theories, he would quote Lord Brougham's writings on democratic government. He said—

> "The course of legislation must always keep pace with the age. The people always communicate to the laws the impression of their own opinions. No sinister influence can interfere to check the progress of improvement; no prejudices of one class, no selfish views have any weight."

He commended that quotation from an English Lord Chancellor to the consideration of the right hon. Gentlemen on the Front Bench. The law they sought to repeal afforded proof of the present peculiar position of the Irish people in relation to the laws which governed them. The Irish people were not permitted to communicate to the laws the impression of their own opinions; on the contrary, Parliament frequently rejected the advice given by the Irish Parliamentary Party who were elected to voice popular opinion in that House. Where a hostile majority prevailed it was the effect of laws like the one they were now discussing that brought English-made law into disrepute and contempt in Ireland and elsewhere. It explained the exclamation of the Irish emigrant in New York who, shortly after his arrival, was asked to join in a demonstration and replied that he would if it was against the Government; for in Ireland the masses of the people were against the Government. Some hon. Members opposite might flout at this incident as trivial, and disregard it as an argument, but to any thinking man it conveyed a message for serious reflections, because the interests of the State which the Government was supposed to represent should be identical with the interests of the majority of its inhabitants. But as John Stuart Mill expressed it—

> "The Government which calmly allowed the emigration of large numbers of its inhabitants stands self-condemned."

The old Roman proverb, *Summum jus, summa injuria*, "the greater the law the greater the injury," might truly be applied to nearly all British Parliamentary legislation dealing with Irish affairs up to a very recent period. At last, owing to the agitation of powerful national organisations in Ireland and the actions of the Irish Parliamentary Party in this House, English legislators had begun to perceive dimly that the interest of the whole society was binding upon every part of the United Kingdom. According to constitutional theory the people were the State, and public opinion should be the breath of the law. But English law makers had in the past apparently based their Irish legislation in many instances upon exactly the opposite doctrine, so it worked out at the present moment that under the provisions of the Local Government Act, men in Ireland who fearlessly advocated popular progressive ideas were picked out for punishment and penalised as criminals by British law—whilst the so-called convicts were rightly regarded by the Irish people as political heroes. Surely this was not a satisfactory evolution of political progress in the twentieth century as a result of what was termed constitutional government.

With regard to the advisability of consulting the people's opinion, it might be useful to quote words used by the right hon. Gentleman the late Colonial Secretary. Some years ago he said—

> "Government by the people meant Government for the people—great social questions which are every day becoming more important can only be satisfactorily settled when the whole of the people take a part in the work of legislation."

Now he maintained that this Bill was a measure of social reform to remove a disability which should never have been placed upon the Statute-book. It was an enactment which penalised the chosen leaders of the Irish people and by a kind of political somersault turned a political proceeding into a crime. So far as he could learn, in no other civilised country was such legal jugglery known nor would it be tolerated in any free nation. It might be the practice in Russia or Turkey, but those were not precedents to justify its adoption in Ireland. It was often argued that they had the same laws in Ireland as in Great Britain, and it might be asked, "Why not disqualify the passive resisters or other political enthusiasts?" If he was correctly informed, a free-fooder in Ireland could be imprisoned with hard labour if prosecuted under this law. But he did not favour coercion, for no man should be persecuted for his opinions, yet that had been customary, perhaps, in Ireland and the sanction of usage and precedent was frequently invoked and would probably be used in the course of this debate. But as Austin, an eminent jurist, laid down—

> "Many of the legal and moral rules which obtain force in the most civilised communities rest upon brute custom and not upon manly reason."

It followed as a necessary corollary that all modern constitutional Governments were more or less revolutionary, changing old formulæ injurious to public expediency and general utility, which were the foundations and measure of civil obedience. As to an argument against the danger of change, Bentham wrote—

> "If the law is good it will support itself. If it is bad it should not be supported by the

irrevocable theory which is never resorted to, but is a veil of abuses."

He would again commend this quotation to the attention of the right hon. Gentleman representing Irish officialism, for Ireland was constitutionally entitled to be governed upon the principle of popular consensus and not of subjection. They urged this claim upon those in temporary office, for as Brougham stated—

> "The mere advantage of an established Government gives no right to the obedience of the people governed contrary to the principle of comparative advantage to the whole community."

If this be not accorded then the higher law of self-preservation would come into operation. It was usual in constitutional Governments that the form and parts of the Legislature, together with the respective powers, office, duration, and mutual dependence of the several parts, should undergo alteration whenever expediency required it, either by the effect of the ordinary action of the Legislature which they were now seeking in the repeal of this obnoxious provision contained in the local Government (Ireland) Act, which, if it was refused, would ultimately be brought about by the interposition of the Irish people. They were constantly told that in Ireland they were living under constitutional government. He did not agree with that at all. They were only nominally under constitutional government. All the officers under a constitutional Government were, and ought to be, simply the creatures of the people who created them by election and maintained them by taxation.

Although the majority in that House did not represent Irish opinion that democratic principle had been recognised to a certain extent in order that local government in Ireland might be made more efficient and more economical than under the old system of centralisation. Parliament therefore passed the Local Government Act with certain reservations and restrictions. The landlords accepted that Act, and so also did the other House of Parliament, possibly for two reasons. One was that the Act was accompanied with a large monetary gift suitable to their interests, and, further, it was probably made the more acceptable as it contained the penal provision they complained of by which advocates of the popular cause who were condemned to hard labour were disqualified. It was the fashion for law-and-order critics who made sneering do duty for philosophy to assert that but for seditious newspapers and mob-orators there would be no agitation in Ireland. But anyone acquainted with the temper of the time, and the practical materialistic trend of this generation, must acknowledge that unless the body politic and its individual units were suffering from a grievance, whether it were sentimental or material, men would neither agitate nor support organisations. The Irish people were compelled to agitate because the House had left them no other alternative. The House must remember that the obligations of the Members and the people were reciprocal. Loyalty was simply a contract. They could not have authority without responsibility. Lord Brougham said—

> "When a Government does not protect the people but rather utilises them as the material to provide rent and taxation, and at the same time oppresses them with rigorous laws which have not the consent of popular sanction, resistance becomes a sacred duty."

further he asked—

> "What is the plain and simple test of the merits of any Constitution—does it secure to the people the best laws at the smallest expense of money and subjection?"

Regarding the first Question, to use a Ministerial phrase, it was answered in the negative by the verdict of the Financial Relations Committee—a jury of financial experts who declared that Ireland was overtaxed by £2,750,000 per annum. With the war taxation it was now beyond £4,000,000 a year. As to the second Question, respecting the smallest expense of subjection, Ireland was saddled with a perpetual Coercion Act, passed in a period of panic. Further, the right to bear arms, which appertained to every citizen in a free nation, was denied to the Irish people, although it was enjoyed by the negroes in America. This proved that the government of Ireland by this Parliament was against the wish of the Irish people; although that consent was the basis of constitutional authority. Unless this Bill was allowed to pass, the policy of gaols for the friends of the people, and office for their opponents, would be perpetuated, like the Coercion

Act. It was evident to those who took the trouble to think out this important problem of Irish government that until popular opinion was consulted there must be intermittent trouble and discontent in Ireland. He had quoted statesmen and jurists, and he could multiply authorities, but he had adduced sufficient evidence to prove his contention. If the Government really desired to have the Local Government Act in Ireland administered on constitutional lines they would at once and without hesitation accept this Bill. The Local Government Act had worked well all over the country, and that proved the capacity of the Irish people to govern themselves. He would, therefore, earnestly impress on the House, which was responsible for the good government of Ireland, the advisability of adopting a wise policy based on constitutional principles. He therefore begged to move the Second Reading of the Bill.

*MR. HAYDEN (Roscommon, S.) said the Bill now before the House was an exceedingly plain and simple one—so simple that it scarcely required any explanation. The Irish Members hoped that the Attorney-General would immediately tell them what was the position of the Government towards the measure. Last year, during, he thought, one of the discussions on the Land Bill, the Attorney-General made a statement which led the Irish Party at least to hope that the Government was favourably disposed towards such a measure as that now introduced. At that time the right hon. Gentleman declared that he was not able to speak expressly for the Government as the Chief Secretary was absent, but he certainly spoke in a manner which led him to think that the provision of the Coercion Act in relation to local government would practically be repealed. The Irish people had shown themselves worthy of the trust reposed in them six years ago, when the system of local government was extended to that country. Every person who had been brought into touch with the working of local government in Ireland, even the most hostile, acknowledged that the system had succeeded far beyond the anticipations of its authors. From the reports of the Local Government Board—not a Board unduly favourably disposed towards Ireland—it was evident that the system had succeeded even better than it had done in England, where for centuries the people had been entrusted with some power of local government.

In the Irish Local Government Act there was a provision which disqualified persons who had been sentenced to imprisonment with hard labour from membership of the local governing bodies. On the broad principle of that disqualification the Irish Party felt no objection whatever; they had no desire that criminals should sit on their local governing bodies, and such persons would not have the slightest chance of election. If any person during his term of office were sentenced to such imprisonment for some criminal act which he had committed the public opinion of the district, and of the body to which he had been elected, would be so strong that he could not act. But in Ireland, unfortunately, they were not able to look at things from the same point of view as persons in England would examine the affairs of their own country. In Ireland there was an extraordinary Act, which was popularly known as the Coercion Act. It was passed seventeen years ago, and it was made perpetual, because it had been found that during each year succeeding the Union it was necessary to pass a Coercion Act. The Act of 1887 was rushed through the House of Commons, owing to the application of the closure. Most of its provisions were never discussed for a single instant. The present Prime Minister, who was then Chief Secretary for Ireland, distinctly promised that in every case there should be an appeal, but that promise had never been fulfilled. It was quite a common thing for the resident magistrates, who in the first instance gave the sentence on prisoners convicted under that Act, and who were not criminals—no one alleged that they were criminals in the ordinary sense—to sentence these prisoners to hard labour for a month, in which case there was no appeal. And to these men there was this disqualification attached under the Local Government Act. The strange part of the whole procedure was that the class of prisoners who, in the main, were convicted under the Coercion Act, were prominent politicians either in the country generally or in their own locality —men respected in the highest degree and who were elected to positions of trust in their own districts and even sent to represent their town or district in that House, and whom not even their most violent enemies alleged to be criminals. Take the attitude of hon. Members of this House towards the persons convicted under the Coercion Act. There were at least thirty Members sitting on these Benches who had been imprisoned under the Coercion Act, many of them sentenced to hard labour. Who, in this House, from the Speaker downward, thought that one of these men was a criminal of the ordinary sort? Hon. Members might think what they liked about their political views. They might differ from them, or be violently hostile to them; they might not like the "flavour" which came from these Benches; but there was one thing absolutely certain, that whether they were Irish landlords, or English Tories, or Liberals, they did not regard these men as criminals. They were not disqualified from sitting in that House; but they were disqualified, if a sentence of hard labour was passed upon them, from sitting in the smallest local representative body in the country. That was an anomaly. Surely if these men were not fit to sit on county councils or urban and district councils they were not fit to sit in the House of Commons. The House of Commons, out of respect to itself, ought to expel them from the House. If they were criminals and if the House of Commons believed them to be criminals it would have the courage to move their expulsion from the House. But the House did not do so, because the law under which so many of the Irish Members had been sent to prison with hard labour, was unconstitutional and one which the House could not now defend.

The Coercion Act had been put into operation on two occasions—first, when it was passed in 1887 and in the succeeding years; and second, three years ago when the present Chief Secretary revived it. Under that Act various persons whom the Chief Secretary frequently consulted, or tried to consult, in reference to the government of Ireland had been sent to prison. And what was the cause of enforcing the provisions of the Coercion Act? It was because there was a strong land agitation in the country. That agitation was succeeded by enactments passed in this House — enactments which, unfortunately, were only partly on the lines of that agitation. Last year, most of the time of Parliament was taken up with the consideration of the Land Purchase Bill. But the land agitation, against which all the Coercion Acts of the last twenty-five years had been passed, was the chief cause of the passage of that Land Purchase Bill. Now, when Parliament had partly confirmed and wholly committed itself to the principle of land purchase, in response to the agitation to which he had referred, and against which the Coercion Act was directed, surely, even if the ordinary law of the land was broken, convictions such as these ought not to be a disability to men sitting on local government boards. The Coercion Act provided for imprisonment, even with hard labour, but it did not attach to that sentence any civil disability. It left the man free as an ordinary citizen of the country. It did not deprive him of his vote. But the Local Government Act came in. As to its general provisions the Irish Members had nothing to say so far as the ordinary law was concerned. But it took in a provision by which the indefensible Coercion Act could be put in force by a stroke of the pen of the Chief Secretary. All that the Irish Members asked was that that provision of the Local Government Act, so far as it applied to hard-labour sentences under the Coercion Act, should be repealed. That was the whole joint. It was a plain, simple, and a very moderate claim. They had a right, if they chose, to make this Local Government Amendment Bill a very elaborate one; but they preferred to confine it to the one point upon which the declaration of the Attorney-General last year gave them some hope and confidence that they would succeed. They, on the Irish Benches, asked the right hon. Gentleman to make, at once, a plain and clear statement as to what was the decision of the Government upon this point. They did not want to make long speeches about Local Government Bills and Coercion Acts; but they asked, what they were entitled to, a satisfactory answer to the Question which he had put.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Sir JAMES HASLETT (Belfast, N.) said that he confessed his high appreciation of the admirable homily which the mover of the Bill had given to them. It reminded him of a clergyman who was deputed to listen to a young student preaching a sermon, and who afterwards inquired whether there was anything wrong with the text: "I thought," he added, "it had got some disease, because you kept so far away from it." The mover of the Bill had certainly kept far away from the measure; but it had been very fully explained by the seconder in arguments which, in his opinion, were unanswerable. There were two principles on which they might inflict punishment, viz., they might directly deprive a man of his liberty, or they might deprive him of his social *status*. He regarded the social *status* as far and away beyond the question of a man's personal liberty. He had always looked with repugnance on a sentence passed upon a man that carried much more beyond it than what was contained within the limits of the sentence. When a man had been sentenced to imprisonment or fine, the general feeling was that he had purged his offence so far as his liability went. He thought this view was very prevalent in the minds of the resident magistrates when they administered the law, and that many of them were taken by surprise, after they had sentenced a man to imprisonment or fine, or both, when they found that that sentence carried with it that man's ostracism from social life. The sentence did not carry with it the penalty of a man being expunged from his rights in connection with this high Assembly; and he cordially agreed with the seconder of the Resolution that if a man was capable of sitting in this House after having undergone hard labour, the greater should include the less. It could not be said that a man who was admitted as a representative of his own people in the first Assembly of the land was not able to represent his people in the smaller representative bodies of his country. He hoped the Attorney-General would take a generous view of this matter. They did not know how soon some of them might be in gaol themselves. He did not say that he spoke feelingly, but one must anticipate and feel how one might be placed some day. At any rate they were all exposed now-a-days to social ostracism. It was not confined to those holding Nationalist views. He himself, as a Unionist, had suffered just as much from his opponents as they had from him; and the scale might be turned some day. But that was not the question at issue. The question was, when a man had undergone the penalty prescribed by law, and thereby had purged his offence, whether he should be submitted to the further ignominy—far greater than either fine or imprisonment—no matter what his character might be, that he should not have the right to sit on the Benches with those who administered the law committed to their charge. He was glad in some respects to join hands with hon. Gentlemen opposite and try to take away what was an unnecessary punishment attached to offences, to some extent social in their character, and which did not carry with them the ordinary idea of criminality.

Mr. MURPHY (Kerry, E.) said he joined with other hon. Members in supporting the Second Reading of this Bill. Last year when this particular point was being discussed, the Attorney-General said further legislation was necessary, and further that no man need cry out until he was hurt. The further legislation was now before the House. The Bill now under discussion only affected a limited number of men in Ireland at the present time, but might affect many in the future. It was a question of principle, and the principle was of vast importance, as had been shown by the fact that though Irish Local Government required reform in various directions this Bill had been confined to this particular matter. The Order under which these things took place, although it had the force of an Act of Parliament, had not the authority of an Act of Parliament. No one in this country would dream of placing a passive resister on a footing with the thieves and pickpockets of this country, and the Government did not pretend that a man sentenced to a term of imprisonment in Ireland for a political offence should be on the same footing as the criminals of that country. The Order was harsh in its administration, and resulted in the exclusion of men of most respectable character from the boards of guardians and the borough and other councils. He was satisfied these rules ought to be altered, and, if the Attorney-General did not agree to the Bill before the House, they would have to come to the conclusion that the expressions he made use of last year were for the purpose of deceiving the House. This Bill would do no wrong to Ireland in removing the disqualifications which had been laid on these gentlemen, and he hoped it would be read a second time.

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): thought the House would do well to remember that the order under which that took place was an Order in Council, and the hon. Member for North Belfast had his hearty and entire concurrence. He trusted, for one, that Members from Ireland sitting on his own side of the House would take a broad and generous view of the question. What did it arise out of? All the squabbles which were the subject of this penalty practically arose out of the Irish land question. And if men brought themselves within the terms of the law—if they went outside the terms of the law and rendered themselves liable to those penalties, he thought they were entitled to take the facts into account, and to remember that a great and generous measure had been passed with the very intention of wiping out all that feeling and making an end of all that friction. He did not believe that it would be possible—and he spoke as one who had taken a tolerably large part in that land question—for these things to occur again in the future. Under the Land Purchase Act things would settle down, and those lamentable expressions of opinion on the part of men who had suffered would not, at all events, be as rife in the future as they had been in the past.

But let him put some other considerations before the minds of hon. Members on the Government side of the House. Even if this Bill were a Statute of the realm and became the law to-morrow any member of the community violating its provisions would still be liable to be sent to prison, would even still be liable to hard labour. What he would escape from would be the further disqualification from sitting on public boards. That was the net provision of the Bill, and was not it the height of absurdity—again he put it to hon. Members sitting on his side of the House, could they find it outside of Ireland that a penalty was applied to a man, and the right was refused him of sitting on a board of guardians or a district council when the full right was reserved to him to come to the House as a knight of the shire, and a representative of the people in the Imperial Parliament? Surely they could not carry absurdity any further than that, and he appealed to his hon. friends from Ulster not to put themselves into that ridiculous position. That, so far as he could see, was the whole Bill—there was nothing else in it. A man might still be imprisoned but would not in the future be disqualified from sitting on a board of guardians and be able to come there, as the hon. Member for King's County did, as representing the people in the Imperial Parliament. The Crimes Act was considered a tolerably rigorous measure. It was not lacking in force; but the Crimes Act did not impose that penalty nor any such penalty. This Bill was a small Bill in a way but a large Bill in another way. As he had said, the penalty arose not from an Act of Parliament passed through that House in an ordinary way but from an Order in Council made in Dublin Castle and laid upon the Table of the House and which not one Member in a hundred had looked at or ever seen. It had a legal force, but no moral force, and he thought that looking at the fact that all the trouble for which those Orders in Council provided arose out of the land question, the House had done its duty in passing a great measure of appeasement. He did hope that the irritating effect of an Order in Council would not be allowed to stand in the way of a settlement of that question.

Mr. BLAKE (Longford, S.) thought the House committed a very grave error in remitting to any executive body the enormous power, by order, to apply and give the force of an Act of Parliament to other enactments. It had been said that what had been done by Parliament for this country when passing the English Local Government Act could not be done for Ireland; that the same attention had not been paid to what was fit and proper to be regulated by an Act of Parliament, because Parliament had not too much time to spare at the time the Bill was passed. They were told then that the price of having the Bill at all was that they must submit to the Local Government Board applying orders to the enactments on the Statute-book of Ireland. He questioned, indeed, whether it was legal to extend an enactment under powers to apply an enactment with modifications. Parliament was responsible for a neglect to perform its legislative duties by surrendering them in this case to an executive body, and Parliament was now called upon to redeem the consequences of that Act, seeing the use which had been made of this surrender. All he asked was that Parliament should remove an excrescence on that English law which deformed the Irish law. He hoped the House of Commons, which was not consciously responsible for this deformity, would now take steps to remove it.

Mr. SLOAN (Belfast, S.) thought it would be quite fitting if, before the Attorney-General replied, something on the other side of the question should be said. Everyone had been quite sympathetic to the claims made by the Nationalist Members, but the merits or demerits of those claims had been discussed from one side only. He was amazed at the speech of the hon. Member for North Belfast, which, in his opinion, was a speech unworthy of the constituency which he represented. Other hon. Members were there to speak their opinions. He was there to speak his, and he was not going to be shouted down in doing so. The hon. Member who seconded the Bill struck a note which he thought settled the whole question when he said that criminal persons would not get a seat on a board. If that were so there was no necessity for the Bill. He would like to have an explanation of the feelings of Nationalist Members on the action of Colonel Lynch, because those hon. Gentlemen had admitted that if placed in the same position as Colonel Lynch by speeches outside the House, they would have done the very same thing, and therefore, if not in action disqualified from sitting in the House, they were certainly disqualified by motive. The mover of the Bill had given them some very interesting extracts as to what lawyers had said regarding the law. If prevention was better than cure, and if Ireland was in the state in which hon. Members now said it was, then there was no reason to pass this Bill. Ireland had to be considered as a peculiar country by itself, and one of the peculiarities of its representatives was that a few days ago they assisted the Government to bring in a Bill for the coercion of Welshmen. In his opinion this action was inconsistent. It was a most unfortunate thing that whenever any question of social reform affecting Ireland and Irishmen came up, hon. Members for Ireland could not unite for the common good of the people. If the county councillors broke the law and were sentenced to imprisonment with hard labour, then the easy remedy was that they should keep the law and it would not then become necessary to put it in force. It struck him that this Bill was an indication of another crusade, or campaign, or agitation on the part of hon. Members opposite—an agitation in which they wanted to avoid this risk of disqualification from sitting on the county councils in the various districts. If it were true, as had been asserted by various speakers, that this disqualification was never again likely to be imposed, why were they so anxious to get this Bill passed? On the ground that prevention was better than cure, he hoped that the Government would stand firm against the Bill.

Mr. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S.) said it was certainly not his intention to beat about the bush with regard to his attitude towards the Bill, because he was opposed to it root and branch. He did not go so far as to say that a man who had been convicted under the Crimes Act and imprisoned was on the same level as an ordinary criminal, but he did say that he was a criminal and as such was not a fit person to sit upon local bodies. [A Nationalist Member: What about this House?] He agreed that it was an anomaly that such a person should be able to sit in Parliament and not in a county council. His way of remedying that would not be the same as that of hon. Members opposite, for he would exclude such criminals from Parliament. Would hon. Members say that the government of Ireland was likely to be conducted on sober and proper lines with such men on the county councils. He maintained that the contrary was the fact. They had received a fine constitutional lecture from two members of the Nationalist Party. They from the North of Ireland, although they numbered no legal luminaries in their ranks, claimed to represent the feeling of the people in that part of the country, which was very strong on the subject. They considered that any surrender on this particular question would be one more of the already too numerous surrenders made by the Government. He was very pleased that the defence of the Bill was placed in the hands of the two Gentlemen on the Treasury Bench (the Attorney-General and the Solicitor-General for Ireland), and was glad that the Royal visit to Ireland had for the time being deprived them of the presence of the Chief Secretary. The Attorney-General was more to their liking. The welfare of Ireland was in better hands to-day. They believed that the settlement of Irish affairs should always be left to Irishmen—at any rate to argue. The question had been dealt with from every variety of standpoint, but from his point of view there was only one question and that was the one of common sense. Was it right and proper that men who had committed crimes, whatever their degree, which in the eyes of the people of the North of Ireland were disgraceful crimes, should be permitted to take part in local government? The North of Ireland felt the greatest concern—not alarm. They were told that it would affect only twelve men throughout the whole of Ireland, and surely it was absurd for the time of that House to be taken up with a discussion on their right to sit on county councils. He strongly opposed the measure.

Colonel **KENYON-SLANEY** (Shropshire, Newport) believed the general opinion of England to be in direct opposition to that which had been voiced by the supporters of this Bill. That conflict of opinion did not arise from any desire to injure or to restrain the onward march of prosperity in Ireland. On the contrary Englishmen had pledged themselves to do their level best to correct the errors of the past, and so to deal with questions affecting Ireland as to remove from her back any burden which she might be unfairly bearing. But English opinion had to be considered. No measure to which English opinion was diametrically opposed could be carried through the House of Commons; therefore, if English Members could make out a case against this Bill, and so secure its rejection, they would be doing that which it was right and proper they should do. Surely it could not be well for the local government of any country to be in the hands of men who, from whatever motive, had broken the law of the land. He believed it would be a source of grave danger if men who had recently been convicted of breaches of the law were allowed to sit on the county councils. The acceptance of the Bill had been urged on the grounds of public expediency and general utility, but it was on those very grounds that he opposed it. The power of the people to govern themselves was being gradually extended, and the fundamental principle that should underlie all extension of liberty was implicit obedience to the law. If persons chose to break that law, they must accept the penalties and disabilities involved in such a line of conduct. He certainly regretted that a similar disability did not attach with regard to membership of this House, because he believed that Gentlemen who attached great value to their position as Members of Parliament would then take care to do nothing to jeopardise their membership. Public expediency demanded the creation in the minds of the people of a settled feeling that the law of the land would be enforced, and it could not make for public expediency that men who at one moment might be leading an agitation against, and inciting to breaches of, the law, should immediately afterwards be allowed to take their seat on the county councils, where they were supposed to administer the law. If that was so in the case of the colder-blooded, slower-thinking Saxon, how much more necessary was it in the case of the hotter-blooded, more impetuous Irishman? General utility would probably be said to consist in bringing into the public service as many capable and excellent individuals as possible. But he had a higher conception of the capacity of his Irish fellow-subjects than to suppose that their choice of capable representatives was so small that unless a dozen convicted men were freed from this disability local government would suffer.

It was said that the Irish people had administered the Local Government Act in a manner which had extorted the admiration of even their bitterest opponents. That had been done without the assistance of these men, and surely it was not impossible to continue without them. Irishmen would doubtless claim to be as strongly opposed as Englishmen to associating with criminals, but there, unfortunately, came in the difference of perspective between the Irish and the Saxon views of criminality. Englishmen could not regard men who had deliberately broken the law and who had been punished therefor simply as virtuous martyrs. Irishmen invested such persons with a halo, but Englishmen regarded them as men who had been responsible for raising in the country a dangerous and turbulent spirit, which had resulted in a disorderly and insurrectionary movement throughout the land. It had been proved that men had set themselves to work in Ireland with the express purpose of creating a local agitation. He did not believe in the idea of setting a thief to catch a thief.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.) said the only man who was ever fined for killing game in the close season was the hon. Member behind him. [Laughter.] He did not mean the hon. Member for Croydon.

COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY thought hon. Members had argued this question too much on personal grounds. They had asserted that the persons who were barred by this Act were so good and capable that they were wanted for the public service; but they ought not to look at a question like this upon personal grounds. On public grounds it would be a very bad thing if those individuals were allowed to do what was asked for. Throughout this Bill they had safeguarded the future. The hon. Member for South Tyrone had said that there was no likelihood of this kind of thing being done in the future, but he noticed that that statement was received with perfect silence by hon. Gentlemen opposite. It had been said that this was only a small matter. It might be a small matter in regard to the individual, but it was a vital question if they allowed men to break the law and to escape the disabilities which that law imposed. From the point of view of the ordinary English Member who had no ill-feeling towards his Irish fellow-subjects they regarded this as an extremely dangerous proposition, which would do mischief and harm in England, and the Government would run the risk of being told that they were not strong enough to enforce the law. The House of Commons could not do a greater disservice to Ireland than to allow it to go forth that they were going to make it possible for Irishmen to break the law in this way. The suggestions put forward in this Bill were most unfortunate, and in his opinion were conceived in a mistaken spirit. If Irishmen would only look at things from an English point of view perhaps they would be able to arrive at a fairly good solution. He was convinced that the great bulk of opinion on this side of the Channel was opposed to this measure, not because they had any ill-will to Ireland, but because they believed that the passing of this Bill would be an unfortunate thing in the interests of the Irish people.

MR. T. L CORBETT (Down, N.) said that before he had the honour of a seat in this House, he was for several years a member of the London County Council; and he had always taken a special interest in local government and the great achievements of local government. He had endeavoured at all times to defend the honour and promote the usefulness of county councils. The hon. Member who seconded the Motion for the Second Reading of this Bill said it was a plain and simple Bill. He entirely agreed with him but contended that its plainness and simplicity meant nothing more or less than giving criminals the right to sit upon county councils. During the many years he was a member of the London County Council there were a few members—some four in all—who became amenable to the criminal law of the country. They all happened to be members of the Radical Party on the London County Council, but every member of that Party vied with the members of the Conservative Party in desiring the earliest possible expulsion and disqualification of those members. He regretted very much that a very different spirit had been shown in this House among members of the Nationalist Party and among some Members, not Nationalists, who had surprised members of the Unionist Party by their utterances.

The demand of this Bill was that crime should be made no disqualification for a member of a county council. [NATIONALIST cries of "No."] That was the demand of this Bill. He knew hon. Gentlemen opposite might differ from him in what they regarded as crime, but he asserted again that the demand of this Bill was that criminals, condemned under the criminal law, should be allowed to be members of the county councils in Ireland. He, for one, would always do his best to prevent that. He believed that in future the demand would be not that crime should be no disqualification but that only members should be elected to those bodies in Nationalist districts who were criminals. That he believed would be the ultimate demand of the Nationalist Party in Ireland. The standing of the county councils in the South and West of Ireland was not too high at present; in fact these bodies had become simply instruments of priestly tyranny. He said that without any qualification whatever. The boycotting in the South and West of Ireland was such that he should have thought that even the Nationalist Party—even the most bigoted of its members—would have hesitated before they introduced a Bill to still further degrade those county councils in the South and West of Ireland, and ask the House to assent to the principle that criminals should in future be allowed to be members of those bodies. To assent to that would be to further degrade the county councils in the eyes of all thoughtful men, belonging to any Party in Ireland, who had thought out the problem of government there. He ventured to say that the House would by an overwhelming majority endorse the opinion of those who opposed this Bill, and who objected to any further degradation of those county councils. He was quite sure that the House would not allow men who had been condemned as criminals to sit upon bodies entrusted with such large powers as were the local bodies in Ireland.

SIR **FREDERICK BANBURY** (Camberwell, Peckham) said he should not like to give a silent vote on this most important question for two reasons. In the first place he had always maintained that what this country should do was to govern Ireland in exactly the same manner as we governed ourselves. If that was a right principle it followed that this Bill, which for the moment would only apply to Ireland, would eventually apply to England. At the present moment the question of municipal government was agitating the whole of the United Kingdom. He did not say that the municipalities were not actuated by the very best principles, but still their manner of conducting business had led to a certain amount of criticism. That criticism had been directed in the first place to the enormous increase in the debt of the different municipalities; and, secondly, to the question of municipal trading. What every Member of the House should do was to see that the members returned to the different municipal councils, borough councils, and boards of guardians, should be those who, irrespective of Party politics, were best qualified to carry out the work they had to do. Did this Bill tend to advance the dignity, *status*, and business qualification of those who were in future to serve on these different councils in Ireland? The first essential to a man being elected to any of these bodies was that he should be a practical man of business. He thought, therefore, that the question they were considering to-day should be decided irrespective of Party politics, and that the only ground on which they should discuss this Bill was that it would or would not in future increase the business capability of those different local authorities. If business capability was an important qualification for English county and borough councillors, it was more important for Irish councillors for this reason. It was often said by hon. Members opposite that Ireland was a poor country. It was essential in a poor country that proper and good administration should be secured, and that economy and efficiency should be considered. When he looked at the Bill he found that its object was to do away with the disqualification that existed at the present moment with respect to persons convicted of offences and crimes. Section 1 of the Bill was in the following terms—

> "So much of Article 12, Sub-section 4, of the Schedule to the Local Government (Application of Enactments) Order, 1898, as enacts that a person shall be disqualified for being elected or chosen or being a member of a council of a county or of a district or of a board of guardians or of any town commissioners, if he has, within five years before his election, or since his election, been convicted either on indictment or summarily of any crime, and sentenced to imprisonment with hard labour without the option of a fine, or to any greater punishments, and has not received a free pardon, shall not apply in the case of any person convicted of any offence or crime, before a Court of summary jurisdiction, under the Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act, 1887, or upon an indictment by a special jury under the said Act; and any person who, before the passing of this Act, has been, or shall hereafter be, so convicted, shall be qualified for being elected or chosen or being a member of a council of a county or of a district or of a board of guardians or of any town commissioners even though he has been or shall be sentenced to imprisonment with hard labour without the option of a fine, or to any greater punishment, and has not received a free pardon."

Of course he did not pretend to be intimately acquainted with the Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act of 1887.

MR. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): It does not apply to the Stock Exchange.

SIR FREDERICK BANBURY said he had no desire to make any special exception for the Stock Exchange or any other body. In his opinion the law should apply equally to Irish, English, and Scotch. He did not wish to go into the question whether or not persons convicted under the Criminal Law and Procedure Act had been political prisoners or not. As far as he knew the result of this Bill would be that persons who had been convicted of boycotting, outrages on cattle, moonlighting, and other offences under that Act would in future be qualified for serving on county councils, district councils, and boards of guardians. He thought, therefore, there were strong arguments against the passing of this particular Bill. If it was desired to exempt people who had only been guilty of political offences—it might be voting for Home Rule or something of that sort—and to allow them to sit on those councils, he personally had not the slightest objection, but if it was to bring in those people who had been convicted of boycotting, or maiming cattle, and sentenced to hard labour, he did not believe anyone in the House would defend the proposal in the Bill. He did not know any more degrading or contemptible offence than the maiming of cattle. It did no good to anyone and only injured a poor animal.

MR. MACVEAGH. The hon. Member forgets that it was proved that the maiming was done by Irish policemen.

SIR FREDERICK BANBURY said he was not arguing by whom it was done, but supposing it was done by a policeman who was convicted, this Bill would enable that policeman to sit on a county council or a district council. [AN IRISH MEMBER: Certainly not.] There was no disqualification if the policeman retired from the force, though he had been guilty of maiming cattle, or had endeavoured to obtain a false conviction of somebody for a serious offence.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): He would be tried under the ordinary law.

SIR FREDERICK BANBURY said that when he had finished his speech perhaps the hon. Gentleman would try to show where he was wrong. He did not think he was mis-stating the case. He knew that the Irish Members had great sympathy with dumb animals, and he had received a certain amount of assistance from them in connection with Bills dealing with that matter. There was one place where it was not a disqualification for sitting to have been convicted of an offence. He believed he was correct in saying that a man who had been convicted could sit in the House of Lords. Did they wish to put the county councils in Ireland on the same basis as the House of Lords? [Cries of "No."] He had always understood that the Nationalist Members objected strongly to the House of Lords, and he should have fancied that their argument would have been that the provisions which enabled this to occur were the remnants of an obsolete feudal age, and that so far from extending them to such enlightened people as councillors in Ireland, they would wish them to be done away with altogether.

This was a matter of the very deepest importance, and he regretted very much that it should have come up on a Friday afternoon, when so many Members were away for the week-end. This was a sort of question which went very far to making or marring the prosperity of the country. [Ironical cheers from the Irish Benches.] These were serious matters, and should be considered in a serious manner. [Renewed ironical cheers from the Irish Benches.] He did not understand the interruption of hon. Gentlemen opposite. Municipal government was a matter in which he had always been seriously interested. [Renewed ironical cheers from the Irish Benches.] He trusted that they would hear from the Attorney-General for Ireland such weighty arguments as to convince hon. Members on that side of the House to vote against the Resolution. He confessed that there were a few on that side of the House who had allowed their usual sound judgment to be carried away by their feeling for their countrymen in Ireland, and he hoped that those hon. Gentlemen, after they had listened to his speech, would repent, and that they would vote against the Second Reading of the Bill.

Mr. JOSEPH DEVLIN (Kilkenny) said he was sure that a large number of Members were somewhat surprised that the Attorney-General for Ireland had not yet spoken in the debate. He could not understand why, in the absence of the Chief Secretary, the hon. and learned Gentleman should hesitate for a moment to declare the intentions of the Government in regard to the Bill before the House. When the question was raised some months ago in this House, the right hon. Gentleman stated that the disqualification placed upon county councillors, the urban and district councillors, could only be removed by legislation; and he did not deny the justice of the claim of the Irish Members. The right hon. Gentleman was understood to say that either he or the Chief Secretary would be prepared to come forward and undo the great evil that had been committed in the Local Government Act. He had been somewhat astonished that day to see such a large turnout of the Ulster Tory Members, who had been absent from the House when far-reaching questions affecting Ireland were being discussed. When his hon. friend the Member for South Tyrone exposed the outrageous conduct of the Land Courts, there was not a single Tory Member present. They revolted on the question of the Bann, and they had now returned to the banks of the Boyne. They had come there, not to promote an essential remedy for an Irish grievance, but to agree to rivet more firmly than ever the chains round Ireland. They had been told in the speeches of the hon. Member for South Antrim, and other hon. Members opposite, that those men who had been charged and convicted under the Coercion Act were criminals, and that criminals should not be allowed to sit either in this House or on county councils, urban councils, and district councils. No one could deny that the late Mr. William Johnston, of Ballykilbeg, was a patriotic Orangeman, and a distinguished representative of his Party. Was the hon. Gentleman opposite prepared to come forward and argue that because Mr. Johnston was once indicted for some political offence, he was a criminal, and that it would have been the duty of this House to expel him from Parliament.

Mr. SLOAN said that if the late Mr Johnston had been guilty of the sedition hon. Members had been guilty of, he should reply in the affirmative.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

MR. JOSEPH DEVLIN said he was making no charge against Mr. Johnston. Even if that gentleman was opposed to the Nationalists in politics, he recognised his right to his opinion; but was it to be assumed for a moment that it could be argued that the late Mr. Johnston was not only a criminal, but that, by the very fact that he had been indicted and convicted of an offence, his membership of this House should be made a nullity. They had had an eloquent homily on Irish criminality from the hon. Member for Shropshire; yet that hon. Member was the bosom friend of Mr. Kensit, who had been convicted of offences against the law. If a man honestly and conscientiously believed a law to be a bad law, he was bound to resist it; and it did not lie in the mouth of an associate of Mr. Kensit, or the successor of the late Mr. Johnston, to come there and lecture the Irish Members on criminality, and tell them that they were incapable of taking part in local government or of promoting the welfare of their own community. The hon. Gentleman opposite talked of the maiming of cattle. That was a criminal offence, which, if committed by a county councillor, would prevent him, in the ordinary nature of things, from being elected again to the county council. But in the case of a policeman who had been guilty of maiming cattle, and of swearing away a young man's life and liberty, the English Government sent him out of the country, and gave him a compassionate allowance. With all respect, the hon. Gentleman opposite might be an exceedingly competent judge of the merits of a Bill of public utility, but he was not a very good judge of what was for the best interests of Ireland. He ventured to say if there was one stronger impeachment than another of the system of government which had operated in Ireland, it was to be found in the very incident to which the hon. Gentleman had referred, and which he ought to have kept silent upon. The question the House had to consider was whether they were going to allow a clause in the Local Government Act to remain, which was never intended to operate as it had done. Everybody knew that county councillors, who had been convicted under the Coercion Act were guilty of no moral offence. These were men who lived in their own districts, who understood the wants of the people, and who had patiently and self-sacrificingly devoted themselves to promote the interests of the people. The very fact that these men had been sent to prison under the Coercion Act would be a passport into office. It was absurd to say that the Irish Members elected by Irish constituencies could come to this House and take part in the discussion, not only of Irish affairs, but of Imperial concerns, and yet were not allowed to become members of a board of guardians, or of county or district councils. It was contrary to common sense. The Bill of his hon. friend was a simple Bill; it dealt with a specific matter which no one could justify, and he earnestly trusted that hon. Members would cast aside political prejudices and vote for the Second Reading.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.) said he had not risen earlier in the debate because he thought that it was desirable that in a debate of that kind the views of all Parties in the House should be heard.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: You were not sure of your majority.

MR. ATKINSON said he shared the sincere regret of the hon. Member for South Antrim that his right hon. friend the Chief Secretary was absent.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG: I said the very reverse.

MR. ATKINSON said he was acquainted with the views of the right hon. Gentleman, and would not for a moment have cared to announce the policy of the Government without first having ascertained what the views of the Chief Secretary were. Before approaching the merits of the Bill, he should like to refer to a personal matter, because it had been said over and over again that some observations of his own last year had raised hopes in the breasts of the Nationalist Members that a Bill of this character would not be opposed. His speech bore no such interpretation; on the contrary, he had strictly guarded himself from giving any pledge that the Government would approve of such a Bill. Moreover, the Bill then under discussion had no resemblance whatever to the Bill now before the House. He had listened with astonishment to some of the speeches which had been made, and with particular astonishment to the speech of his hon. friend the Member for North Belfast. With one part of that speech he thoroughly agreed, but he was astonished when his hon. friend announced that as soon as a man was convicted of crime, no social disqualification should fall on that conviction.

Sir JAMES HASLETT said that what he had stated was that after a man had paid the penalty for a crime he had committed no social ostracism should be put upon him.

Mr. ATKINSON said that the whole history of the law was against that contention.

Mr. MACVEAGH: You ought to give him six months for that speech.

Mr. ATKINSON said that the principle had always been laid down since corporations and public bodies were formed, that conviction for crime was legitimate and good cause for the expulsion of a member from those bodies. The Education Act of 1870, which was passed by a Liberal Government, provided that if a man was convicted of any crime, no matter of what character, and no matter before what tribunal, that should disqualify him from becoming a menber of a School Board.

Mr. EDWARD MITCHELL (Fermanagh, N.): Are the passive resisters in England disqualified?

Mr. ATKINSON said he had been equally astonished at the speech of the hon. Member for Longford, because that hon. and learned Gentleman seemed to think that this disqualification which existed in the Irish Local Government Act was something brought about or enacted by the Lord-Lieutenant. What was the fact? When the Liberal Government in 1894 passed the English District Councils and Parish Councils Bill they put in the 46th Section a provision that if any person were convicted, either on indictment or summarily, and got hard labour, he was thereby disqualified from service on such bodies.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: Under the ordinary law.

Mr. ATKINSON said that when the Irish Local Government Bill of 1898 was passed the principle was adopted of enabling the Lord-Lieutenant in Council to adopt by Order certain enactments which were put in the schedule, and the schedule was part of the Bill. In that chedule was the 46th Section of the English District Councils and Parish Councils Act. The Lord-Lieutenant, acting under the 105th Section of the Irish Local Government Act, put in force the powers conferred upon him by the 46th Section of the Act of 1894, and that order was, in pursuance of the 107th Section of the Act, laid on the Table of the House, when it was perfectly competent for any hon. Member to move an Address that the whole or part should not be approved of. That was not done. The result was that the provisions of the 46th Section of the English Act of 1894 were incorporated into the Irish Act, and the law as to qualifications of members of local bodies was precisely the same to-day in England and Ireland.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: This Bill does not propose to change it; it only deals with the Coercion Act.

Mr. ATKINSON said he had only alluded to this matter to endeavour to put aside much of the misconception which prevailed in regard to the fact of the Order of the Lord-Lieutenant modifying the provisions of the Local Government Act. It modified it in no way whatever. It was not proposed by the Bill before the

House in any way to modify the provisions of the Local Government Act, and therefore he assumed that the authors of this Bill thought it extremely undesirable that any man convicted of a crime, either before a magistrate summarily, or before any other tribunal, where hard labour was imposed, should sit on a county or district council; and therefore all the eloquence they had heard dealing with the motives of criminals was beside the point. Some of the greatest crimes of the world had been committed by men with the highest motives. In this country no one would say that the same moral opprobrium attached to crime committed under labour combinations, such as picketing, as to many other crimes; but a man convicted of this offence would be disqualified from serving on a district council or a board of guardians in this country, just as much as if he had been convicted of bigamy. This Bill was misnamed when it was called a Bill to reform the Local Government Act. A more appropriate title for it would be "A Bill to throw discredit on the machinery of the Crimes Act." What it enacted was that although it should remain the law that any man convicted and sentenced to hard labour for any offence should be disqualified from sitting on county and district councils, that provision should not apply to any conviction obtained in any way through the instrumentality of the Crimes Act. [NATIONALIST cheers.] Those responsive cheers showed the accuracy of his description of the Bill. If hon. Members opposite expected him to say that convictions under the Crimes Act, whether by magistrates or by special juries, were no convictions, bad convictions, unjust convictions, he was afraid they would be disappointed.

AN HON. MEMBER: And packed.

MR. ATKINSON said that the observation was irrelevant, and did not meet his point as to a common jury or a special jury. The liability to packing was not in point, although the observation was intended to be offensive he had no doubt. Of course a special jury could be packed as well as a common jury. Then if hon. Members expected that he, on behalf of the Government, would say that convictions under the Crimes Act, whether by magistrates, or by special juries, were no convictions, bad convictions, unjust convictions, they would, he was afraid, be disappointed. He made no such admission on behalf of the Government. If it were true, that would be a reason for inflicting no punishment at all, but if they were just enough and right enough and fair enough to warrant imprisonment and warrant fines, it was absurd to say they were not just enough and fair enough and right enough to warrant the social disqualification which followed. There, therefore, could be no justification for the Bill except upon two grounds. The first was that crimes dealt with by the Crimes Act were no crimes at all, and the second was that no tribunal, whether by magistrates or special jury obtained under the Crimes Act, could give a decision which commanded respect. Now, as regarded the first point, what were the crimes with which the Crimes Act dealt, because this was a matter dealing with the Crimes Act and with that alone. It just dealt with three classes of crimes which could be conveniently described, one of which had now become almost a fine art, that was boycotting.

MR. KILBRIDE (Kildare, S.) said that the hon. Member for Oldham suffered from it on the other side of the House.

MR. ATKINSON said that everyone who knew what boycotting was knew that it came within the reach of the criminal law. It was vain for gentlemen to protest. It was vain for them to protest that the conspiracy to injure, to inflict not only social ostracism but financial ruin upon any man, was legal. The contrary had been decided in Ireland, the contrary had been decided in England. It was a crime. He dared say some hon. Gentleman thought that, provided it were done to forward an agrarian object, it was legitimate or excusable. The law could not adopt that view. No Government could adopt that principle. So far as he was concerned, and he had some professional knowledge of it, he knew of no crime that to his mind was at once more mean and more cruel. It was in vain for hon. Gentlemen to say that boycotting was not a crime. They had had an exhibition of it in Ireland recently in the Tallow case, unsurpassed in cruelty except in its imposture, because the principal boycotter, who was striking in defence of the evicted tenants, was all the time going secretly to the rent office to get possession of the evicted farm. Many hon. Members thought that boycotting was legitimate when resorted to for a particular object. No Government could adopt that principle. Treason very often had been actuated by the highest motives, but any Government that had regard to its own existence must punish it with the severest penalties. The other crime was intimidation. Well, it was useless to say that intimidation was not a crime. What was another? Riot and unlawful assembly. Well, the last person to deny that was a crime should be, he thought the hon. Member for the Scotland Division. He, they knew, was almost a slavish worshipper of trial by jury, but it showed how the mighty sometimes fell, because when the Crimes Act of 1882 provided that no man could be tried for riot and unlawful assembly before two magistrates unless the particular district were proclaimed, the hon. Member for one of the Divisions of Donegal proposed that that provision with regard to the trial of rioting and unlawful assembly before magistrates should be extended to the whole of Ireland, proclamation or no proclamation, and that was seconded by the hon. Member for the Scotland Division. The reason given was that because without any trouble, or any annoyance, or any delay, the Government would be able to bring up the rioters of Belfast before two President magistrates and have them convicted. He was quite sure the hon. Member would not desire for an instant that a different measure of justice should be dealt out to political opponents than to those who supported him. Therefore he could not say that rioting and unlawful assembly was legal. The next was obtaining forcible possession. The next crime was assault upon sheriffs, constables, bailiffs, and process servers, and the ministers of the law. What moral elevation was there about these crimes that those convicted of them should not be disqualified? In the crimes themselves there was unquestionably nothing which ought to protect their perpetrators from the consequences of legal disqualification.

It was said that argument was itself all true. Those crimes were punishable by law. They did not mean for a moment to permit men who were convicted of crime to sit upon county boards, but they must be convicted by a common jury, not by a special jury, or by two resident magistrates. A conviction before a common jury was a good conviction, and a good cause for disqualification, but a conviction before a special jury was not to be a slur. The Bill made special provision in the first clause "or upon any indictment by a special jury under the said Act." It seemed strange, inasmuch as in civil proceedings either party could get a special jury by serving notice upon the other side, and under the Act of 1882, introduced by the Liberal Government, the criminal practice was assimilated to the civil practice, and it was competent either for the Crown or the accused to get a special jury. If the only thing objected to was conviction by magistrates, why was this included? Why was the provision introduced that no disqualification should follow a conviction by a special jury. The reason obviously was that the special jury was obtained under the Crimes Act. No matter how fair, how respectable they might be, no matter how they considered the case before them, there was to be no disqualification. The other objection was to convictions before the magistrates. He thought hon. Members might give this Government, and indeed any Government, credit for desiring not to put the Crimes Act in force, or not to supersede the ordinary tribunals if they could avoid it. He did not suppose, however convinced they might be of its evil influences and evil designs, this Government, or any Government, desired to put the Crimes Act into force if they could avoid it, but any Government might be, and both Governments had been, forced into this position, that they must either put it into force or allow lawlessness to be triumphant. Now hon. Members would not take him as an authority in this matter, but he thought they might take the Leader of the Opposition as an authority. When was the Crimes Act put into force? The Crimes Act was put in force and the ordinary tribunals were superseded, when the ordinary tribunals would not act and there was perfect immunity to crime.

An HON. MEMBER: Who judges it?

Mr. ATKINSON said the executive Government of the day. Were the criminals to be the judges? There were only the two——

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): The nation.

Mr. ATKINSON: The nation judged when in 1887 it put that power into the hands of the executive Government. The Leader of the Opposition described pithily in 1885 the condition of things which justified the Crimes Act. Dealing with the existing Act of 1882, which was more extreme, superseding trial by jury even in capital cases, the Leader of the Opposition said, in a speech made at Perth: "The key of the whole position was this, that in many parts of Ireland in certain classes of offences, especially offences of an agrarian character, they could not trust to the ordinary class of jurymen doing their duty. Partly from ignorance, partly from prejudice, but mainly from the cruel and overbearing system of terror under the National League, they could not be sure on clearest evidence of obtaining a verdict. It was not merely desirable but necessary to devise some means to overcome that difficulty, and it might very well become a permanent part of the law."

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs) said he remembered the speech very well. The change that he thought should be introduced into Ireland and into England, and become a part of the permanent law, was allowing the jury to find a verdict by a majority.

Mr. ATKINSON said that that might be the opinion of the hon. Gentleman, but it was not put into words. He supposed the English language meant the same in Scotland as in England.

Mr. Atkinson.

Mr. THOMAS SHAW (Hawick Burghs) said that the English language did not mean the same. The verdict in a criminal case in Scotland meant a verdict possibly by a majority.

Mr. ATKINSON said he was aware of that fact. It was unfortunate when the right hon. Gentleman was dealing with the matter he never alluded, as far as he could see, to the matter which seemed to have been in his thoughts. There was no reference to the verdict of a majority. At all events he accurately described the position. When the ordinary law broke down they must have recourse to extraordinary tribunals of some character. How could the Act of 1882 be justified unless it were upon the principle that the ordinary tribunals were insufficient? How could they justify giving, as they did in that Act, the trial for murder to three Judges, without a jury, unless it were that they must supersede the ordinary tribunals if the condition of society did not enable them to leave them in operation. Trial by jury must rest upon this basis, that they had a stratum of society which would assist in putting the law in force against those who violated it, whoever they might be, or whatever their opinions. The moment they could not get jurymen who would resolutely, in the jury-box, dispense the law without fear or favour, they must have recourse to some special tribunal, or they would allow crime to be triumphant. He would not deal with the conditions which, at a time of crisis, made trial by common jury absolutely a useless sham. In times of public excitement, agrarian in their character, in all parts of Ireland they could not get the law enforced. That was a justification for the application of the Crimes Act, and therefore he could not consent that the decisions of the ordinary tribunals should be treated with contempt. So far as the future was concerned he most ardently hoped that it would never be again necessary to put the Crimes Act into force in Ireland, and if it were never again necessary to put it into force there would be no necessity for the present Bill. The more ardent that hope, the more reason for the expectation that it would not be necessary to put the Act into force again, the more unnecessary would be this proposed legislation. It was true that one of the clauses of the Bill was retroactive in its operation, and proposed to remove the disqualification in respect to persons who had been convicted under the Act. The number of persons sentenced to imprisonment with hard labour under the Act was fifty-six; of these twenty-one were members of local boards, but, as seven had the hard labour revoked on appeal, there were only fourteen individuals to whom the retroactive clause of the Bill would apply. Although he hoped that the Crimes Act would never be put into force again, he could not on behalf of the Government give legislative sanction to the proposal that sentences pronounced by the tribunals under the Act were not to be followed by the ordinary results which followed similar sentences in all parts of the kingdom.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland) said he was not surprised at the speech of the right hon. Gentleman. He had stuck to the ancient system because he was part of it. He was its flower and fruit and he would stick to the Dublin Castle system as long as there was a stone on the ground. Everyone saw that the system was disappearing. None were now so poor as to do it reverence, except an infinitesimal section of the House of Commons and the official class represented by the right hon. Gentleman. He thought that the right hon. Gentleman would at least have been fair. His speech was worthy of the Crown Prosecutor in the thirties or forties, and, indeed, in even a more remote period. His complaint of the speech of the right hon. Gentleman was that it was not only unwise, but that it was unfair. The right hon. Gentleman said several times that there was no disability on Irishmen which was not also on Englishmen, and that the law was the same in the two countries, and that a man who committed a criminal offence would be excluded from a school board in England, just the same as a man who committed a criminal offence would be excluded from a county council in Ireland. But that was not the matter with which the Bill dealt. The Bill proposed no change whatever in the law. The right hon. Gentleman misrepresented the scope of the Bill, though he explained the difference later; but the whole gravamen of his speech was to get the House of Commons into a mood to regard the Bill as a demand to secure different treatment for politicians in Ireland to that meted out to politicians in England.

They had had during the debate speeches from the hon. Baronet the Member for Peckham and the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for the Newport Division of Shropshire. The hon. and gallant Gentleman referred to sedition, and the hon. Baronet to the maiming of cattle. It was not fair to say that Irish Members asked for preferential treatment for crime in Ireland as compared with England; all they asked was that convictions under exceptional tribunals peculiar to Ireland should not have the same power as convictions for crime in England. He was surprised that the right hon. Gentleman should have said that they, in this Bill, desired to safeguard the rights of those who had been tried and convicted by special juries under the Crimes Act. The right hon. Gentleman knew perfectly well that, under his skilful manipulation, all kinds of juries could be packed in Ireland. The right hon. Gentleman now came forward and said he would not agree to this Bill because it cast a stigma on the administration of the Crimes Act. And this in spite of all that had occurred; in spite of all that was known to his mind, and that must be always present to his conscience, of what had occurred under special jury packing. The convictions under the Crimes Act were the result of trial by a tribunal which the English people would have done away with in this country two centuries ago. If he were to relegate the question to any six rational Englishmen on the opposite side, not blinded by political passion, they would say, "Why, in Heaven's name, should not this Bill be passed?" Even if at the time when the Crimes Act was passed it was regarded as a necessity, much had happened since. The Land Act had been passed—which would not perhaps be law to-day but for the fourteen gentlemen who were now suffering for having helped the Chief Secretary to pass it—an Act which would be an enduring monument of his administration in Ireland. The former state of things had ceased to exist, and, that being so, the Government acted most unwisely in refusing the Second Reading of the Bill.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON (Armagh, N.) said the hon. Member for the Scotland Division had drawn a legally accurate and pleasant picture of Ireland. Ireland was peaceful, more peaceful than it had been for years. Why was that? He remembered a remark made by the late Lord Salisbury years ago. Lord Salisbury then said that what Ireland wanted to make her peaceful and happy was twenty years of resolute government. If he remembered right, seventeen years had elapsed since that speech was made. During the interval Ireland underwent many experiences which could under no circumstances be described as peaceful, but now she was at rest. He personally was pleased when he understood that this Bill was to come before the House lest they should forget what had taken place in the past. He had not of late years tried to rake up old animosities, and when he had referred to them he had done so with a sheathed sword, but this Bill inevitably brought before the House the times which he, and they who sat with him, tried to forget, and which many of the Radicals who sat with hon. Gentlemen opposite would like to forget. Ireland at the present moment was at peace. There was an Act in Ireland at the present time called the Crimes Act, and when that Act was discussed in this House he remembered Mr. Gladstone and other illustrious Gentlemen drawing a terrible picture of what would inevitably occur if the Bill became law, namely, that Ireland would be a discontented and disloyal country. Had those prophecies been realised? No one was more delighted than himself to be able to agree with the speech of the hon. and learned Member for Waterford that Ireland, so far as crime was concerned, would compare favourably with any country in the world; that Ireland was at the present moment ahead of England, Scotland, and Wales in the matter of crime. But that was not always so. They had had two experiences of Ireland during the last seventeen years; they had had Ireland under the law of the Leagues and under the law of Parliament. What was its condition when the Land League and the National League were triumphant? In this country if a man went out into the street and broke a policeman's head it was a crime; in Ireland if he went out and shouted Home Rule and broke a policeman's head, he was a hero. He himself did not differentiate crime in that way, but the whole object of this Bill was to differentiate crime under the Crimes Act and crime under the ordinary law. That was its whole object. Hon. Members opposite, in their political manœuvres, did not differentiate crime and crime, but what they desired to do now was to get the House to affirm that there was a great moral difference in intimidating a man for political purposes and intimidating him for other purposes. He denied that. Crime was crime if it was against the law. It had been suggested that an Irishman who had been convicted of a crime might be allowed to sit in this House while he was not allowed to sit in an assembly dealing with county management. That was perfectly fair and just. When they became excited he was glad hon. Gentlemen opposite were in the House of Commons. He looked upon the hon. Gentlemen opposite as eighty specimens of men who ought never to be placed in a position of authority either in Ireland or in any other country. When Gentlemen on the Irish Benches were in the House of Commons they had no power of intimidation. Other Members did not intimidate them when they were making their speeches. They were not intimidated, and they expressed very candidly their opinion of the views which other hon. Members expressed. But in Irish county councils those gentlemen who practised intimidation had no one to keep their eye upon them. In the county councils they had no one to bring them to book for their conduct. There was a very clear difference between the position of Members of the House of Commons and members of the county councils. The hon. Member for the Scotland Division of Liverpool seemed to imagine himself to be the Irish nation. Hon. Gentlemen opposite could be taken to represent the majority of the Irish people. If the people fancied to be represented by hon. Gentlemen opposite let them have their choice, but he would never choose to be represented by hon. Members on the Irish Benches. If the Irish people wanted to prove to demonstration that they were practically unfit to govern themselves they could not do it better than by sending hon. Gentlemen opposite to represent them in the House of Commons. He asked anybody with any brains there present, Would anybody outside a lunatic asylum consent to be governed by hon. Gentlemen opposite? He was sure he had expressed the opinion of every Gentleman who sat on the Ministerial side of the House and of a great many of the Liberal friends of hon. Gentlemen opposite. Liberal Members were quite willing to consent to Nationalist Members going over to Ireland to govern the Irish people, but, if it were proposed that Nationalist Members should govern them, Liberal Members would hold a very different view. If Irish Members had come down to the House and said the evil days of intimidation and political crime had passed away and changed—he himself saw no sign of reformation—if they had said——

Mr. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.) asked if the right hon. Gentleman was aware of any case of intimidation on the part of the landlords to make their tenants pay exorbitant rents.

Colonel SAUNDERSON could not for the life of him see how an Irish landlord could possibly intimidate a tenant.

Mr. FLAVIN remarked that if the right hon. Gentleman wanted an instance he could give him plenty.

Colonel SAUNDERSON believed the hon. Member must be mistaken, He could quite understand a tenant intimidating a landlord, but that a landlord under the Land Act could possibly intimidate a tenant he could not conceive. If hon. Gentlemen opposite would say they had changed their political course, were no longer disloyal to the British Empire, that they would wave the Union Jack, hate all the enemies of this country, glory in all the triumphs achieved by the British Army all over the world, and show the House that they had changed their views and wished bygones to be bygones there might be something to say, if they believed them, about passing this Bill. This Bill was a sort of an advance guard to a direct attack upon the Crimes Act. It was to place a depreciated value on the Crimes Act which was the object of the Bill. Next Wednesday he believed they intended to attack the Crimes Act itself. Could they show they had modified their views on the most microscopic point [Nationalist cries of "No."] Hon. Gentlemen opposite were perfectly honest, they said: "As we were in the days of Land and National Leagues—in the days of violence, outrage, and crimes in Ireland, so we are now." And being the same they had come to the House, and would continue to do so until their friends above the gangway occupied the Treasury Bench, with the hope that they could persuade them to consolidate the Empire by handing Ireland over to its greatest enemies. He had always asserted that hon. Gentlemen opposite could, if they chose, keep the Irish people quiet, and he remembered saying years ago that Mr. Parnell held the tap of crime in his hand and could turn it on or off as he liked.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: You are insulting the memory of Mr. Parnell.

Colonel SAUNDERSON denied doing any such thing, and pointed out that what he called crime hon. Gentlemen did not—and Mr. Parnell did not. At the present moment Ireland was a network of the National League. All the old machinery of the Land League, which to his mind blackened the history of Ireland with many crimes, would come again into existence. This was the time when they wanted to take away the Crimes Act.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is a Bill, I understand, before the House next week for the purpose of dealing with the Crimes Act, but that is not this Bill.

Colonel SAUNDERSON said this Bill dealt with the effect of the Crimes Act, and was moved with the endeavour to impair the working of the Act. It was a Bill undeserving of the support of the House of Commons, and undeserving of the support of any man who really desired to see a peaceful Ireland, and for that reason he cordially opposed it.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND said he had observed a considerable change in the atmosphere of that House in regard to Irish affairs generally, and he knew of no better indication of the beneficent nature of that change than was to be found in the fact that whereas, not so very long ago, when the right hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh treated them to a speech such as they had just heard, it aroused a considerable feeling of anger and indignation, nowadays the invariable effect was to create much amusement and merriment. It was always one good feature of the right hon· Member's speeches that they were never taken seriously by his Irish opponents; they only elicited a certain amount of ridicule and good-natured laughter. But there was just one point in the speech which was worthy of serious comment. The right hon. and gallant Gentleman said it was in the power of the Irish Nationalists, whenever they thought fit, to practically turn crime off and on in that country. He asserted that in the days of Mr. Parnell, the great Leader of the Irish Party—now many years in his grave—that power existed, and that Mr. Parnell was able at his will to have crime in Ireland or to prevent it. Mr. Parnell had a stormy career in political affairs; he had many enemies, but he did think it was an unworthy aspersion on the memory of Mr. Parnell to say that at any time in his career he approved of anything in the shape of crime or outrage in Ireland. It was a well-known historical fact that Mr. Parnell's influence was exercised to teach the Irish people to use their constitutional power in the House, and not to have recourse to the wild justice of revenge. His belief was that, if it had not been for the interference of Mr. Parnell—one of the greatest statesman of the last century, whose memory would ever be revered and respected by the Irish people—in the direction of Irish affairs, crime and outrage would have been more widespread than they were years ago. The hon. and gallant Gentleman in his characteristically Irish speech exclaimed—"Thank Heaven I am not ruled by hon. Gentlemen opposite!" and he added that nobody outside a lunatic asylum would dream of allowing themselves to be ruled by the eighty Nationalist Members. Did the right hon. and gallant Gentleman believe that? Did he contend that the British Constitution was framed and based on the rules and orders which obtained only in a lunatic asylum? Did he consider that the British people were no better than the inmates of a lunatic asylum? If so, why did the British people insist on having the Nationalist Members in that House to help them in governing the country? Why did they give them a voice and votes to control English, Scotch, and Welsh affairs, and to assist in shaping the destinies of the whole Empire? The right hon. and gallant Gentleman had paid but a poor compliment to those who were maintaining the Union at the present time, because it was well within the knowledge of everybody, despite the sneers and gibes of the right hon. Gentleman, that the presence of the Irish Members in that House during the last 100 years had been marked by much good done for the welfare of the people at large, and the records of Parliament showed that the most beneficent reforms in the interests of the British people had been carried into law by the work and votes of the Nationalist Members who had been sneered at that day.

Colonel SAUNDERSON: I did not object to Irishmen being here. I look upon the House of Commons as a mixture —and a very good mixture—of English, Irish, Scotch, and Welsh.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND said the right hon. and gallant Gentleman had suggested that the Irish Members were not to be trusted, but it had repeatedly been in their power to make and unmake Governments, and many great measures of reform could not have been carried but for their support. Was not the right hon. Gentleman inconsistent when he asserted that the Nationalists were not to be trusted? Why, it had been shown in the recent history of Ireland that the most turbulent portion of the country had been found in the northern constituencies represented by the right hon. and gallant Member and his friends. It was in the North of Ireland that had occurred the most deplorable scenes which reflected upon the common name of civilisation. When the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Montrose Burghs was in office as Chief Secretary they had one of the most bloody and terrible riots ever heard of in the history of the country in the streets of Belfast, and on that occasion the minority of the Catholic people were driven to their death and persecuted in the most relentless fashion by the friends of the right hon. Gentleman and his colleagues. That was the outcome—pure and simple—of religious bigotry. [Cries of "Question."] Well, if hon. Members opposite did not like what he was saying they could reintroduce the system of boycotting, and in the chivalrous spirit in which they dealt recently with the hon. Member for Oldham, they could walk out of the House. They had done so before, and he confessed that he for one never missed them. Unfortunately, whenever an era of reform set in in Irish affairs there was always something left behind—small in itself, perhaps—which had the effect of irritating the Irish people and spoiling the effect of the reform. Last year, they were told, was inaugurated a period of better feeling—greater toleration was to prevail in the future, and yet the Government now refused to remove a disqualification which had been placed on fourteen men only, and thereby they were seriously injuring the chances of the success of last year's reform. In refusing this small measure of reform the Government would only foster the irritation and discontent in Ireland which had of late shown symptoms of disappearing altogether. The Attorney-General for Ireland had made a very bitter speech. He had spoken with much vehemence about crime and outrage, but no one knew better than the right hon. and learned Gentleman that no single one of the fourteen men whose cause they were fighting to-day was convicted of anything whatever in the shape of crime. The majority were sent to prison merely for attending meetings held to be illegal, and he might mention a case in Clare, where of three men convicted of one and the same offence only one was sent to hard labour and incurred this disqualification, while the other two, although sent to gaol, escaped hard labour and the disqualification. That was simply an outrage on justice, and he could only say in conclusion that the continuance of this disqualification imposed on local representatives would not have the slightest deterrent effect.

Mr. HEMPHILL (Tyrone, N.) said he listened with great regret to the speech of the right hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for North Armagh. Such speeches only served to obstruct remedial legislation for Ireland, because Members for England and Scotland who listened to them were naturally at a loss to know how to exercise their fair unbiased judgment. One could forgive the hon. Members for Peckham and the Newport Division of Shropshire because they knew nothing about Ireland or the condition of the people and had no sympathy with Irishmen and anything Irish. But when Irishmen followed in the same course of gibes and flouts he was reminded of the familiar saying of that bitter satirist Dean Swift: "If you want an Irishman roasted you must get another Irishman to turn the spit." It was a shocking spectacle, when all Europe was listening with pleasure to the loyalty expressed in Ireland to the Crown, that efforts should be made to mislead the judgment of the English people by making them believe that by the passing of this Bill any injury could result to the interests of the country. Now he wished to say a word or two as to the speech of the Attorney-General. He was quite willing to accept the right hon. Gentleman's statement that he never intended last year to convey an idea that he would give any countenance to a measure like this. But he was bound to say that the criticisms of the right hon. Gentleman were not calculated to enable English and Scotch Members to understand what this really short and simple Bill amounted to. One would suppose that it was an attempt to differentiate between Ireland and the rest of the United Kingdom. That was exactly contrary to the fact. It would place the law affecting disqualifications in the two countries on exactly the same basis. Hard labour was no part of the common law of the land, but from time to time Statutes had been passed enabling the Courts to add hard labour to ordinary sentences of imprisonment in cases of exceptional moral turpitude as distinct from ordinary breaches of the law, and the Irish Local Government Act, which set out the schedule of the English Act, was only intended to give the power of compulsory hard labour under similar circumstances. The Order in Council introduced a modification placing the offences against the Crimes Act in the same category as ordinary offences.

MR. ATKINSON made an observation which was inaudible in the Press Gallery.

MR. HEMPHILL said that if that was the case the present Bill would be unnecessary, because its object was to secure that where conviction had taken place under the Criminal Procedure Act of 1887 the consequence of disqualification should not follow. The Act was so construed as to treat the Order in Council as entailing disqualification, and hence it was that the fourteen persons to whom reference had been made had been disqualified. But it was not a question of the merits or demerits of the Order in Council with which the House was now concerned. The point at issue was that in England such a disqualification did not arise, and the object of the Bill was simply to assimilate the law in Ireland to that in England. After long delay and much agitation the boon of local self-government was conferred upon the people of Ireland. Was that boon now to be rendered nugatory by the operation of this disqualification? That was really the question the House had to consider. The local councils were representative of the masses of the people of the country; the members had the confidence of their fellow ratepayers, and under the Local Government Act they were entrusted with the management of all local affairs. Were such men to be disqualified from taking part in the adminstration of local affairs by the capricious exercise of the authority of two removable magistrates in adding hard labour to the sentence for an offence of a political nature? It was not the imprisonment, but the addition of hard labour, which constituted the disqualification, and it was intolerable that such a political weapon should be placed in the hands of magistrates who could be dismissed by the Lord-Lieutenant without cause assigned or notice given. At a time when all classes in Ireland were trying to forget their past differences, when Irishmen seemed to be vying one with another in their demonstrations of loyalty to the person of their Sovereign, and when there was a prospect of the recent Land Act throwing oil on the waters which for centuries had been troubled, it was lamentable that the representative of the Government should have delivered himself of such a harsh and acerbating speech on so simple a Bill as that under discussion.

Mr. HEYWOOD JOHNSTONE (Sussex, Horsham) desired to give the measure a word of welcome. He had not read the Bill, but his experience had shown him that that was not at all necessary to enable a Member to address the House. He had gathered from the debate that it was intended to remove certain disqualifications for public office from gentlemen who had been convicted for offences under special Irish legislation, disqualifications that did not stand in the way of English county council candidates. There was a misconception which he desired to clear up. Under a Statute of George II., persons convicted of a certain offence were liable to be fined, whipped, or imprisoned, and to deprivation of all civil rights, so that no position would be left open to them except that of a professional politician or a passive resister. The crime to which that penalty attached was that of the slaughter or skinning of a beast by a licensed horse-slaughterer in any place other than that to which his licence applied. In the face of that enactment, it should not be said that Englishmen were so much better off than the people of Ireland. He welcomed the Bill because it showed that there was a desire in Ireland to take part in local government. He remembered well the enthusiasm that the passing of the Parish Councils Acts aroused in England. Soon after the creation of parish councils he had a conversation with a blacksmith, who remarked how pleased his old mother would have been if she knew he was entitled to put "P.C" after his name. He regretted that such enthusiasm was dying out in England, but it was a happy augury for the future that in Ireland the people were so anxious to take part in the local government of the country that it should have been thought worth while for the sake of fourteen persons—that being the number affected by the Bill—to bring this measure before the House of Commons and have a whole afternoon's discussion upon it.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 137; Noes, 205. (Division List No. 101.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Ambrose, Robert
Asher, Alexander
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Austin, Sir John
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Black, Alexander William
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burke, E. Haviland
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Channing, Francis Allston
Cogan, Denis J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Crean, Eugene
Crombie, John William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan
Delany, William
Devlin, Charles Ramsay (Galway
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny N.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Ellice, Capt. E C (S. Andrw's Bghs
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir Francis H. (Maidstone
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gilhooly, James
Grant, Corrie
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Lewis V. (Rossendale
Hayden, John Patrick
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Horniman, Frederick John
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce Michael
Kilbride, Denis
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leamy, Edmund
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Lundon, W.
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William
Mitchell, Edw. (Fermanagh, N.)
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, William
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P.J.
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham)
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Power, Patrick Joseph
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Roche, John
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Russell, T. W.
Schwann, Charles E.
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R. (Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Wallace, Robert
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Weir, James Galloway
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Ayes—Sir Thomas Esmonde and Captain Donelan.

NOES.

Allsopp, Hon. George
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir H.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barry, Sir Francis T. Windsor)
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Michael Hicks
Beckett, Ernest William
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Bowles, Lt.-Col. H. F. (Middlesex
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Brown, Sir Alex. H. (Shropsh.)
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Campbell, J. H. M. (Dublin Univ
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. A (Worc.
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Rt. Hon. Sir John C. R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T.L. (Down, North)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Dewar, Sir T. R. (Tower Hamlets
Dickson, Charles Scott
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-

Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland,SirFred Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hn. Sir John E.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn.Sir William Hart
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fergusson, Rt.Hn.SirJ.(Manc'r
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzroy, Hon.EdwardAlgernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Fyler, John Arthur
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gore,Hn G.R.C.Ormsby-(Salop
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.
Gorst, Rt.Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.)
Gunter, Sir Robert
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton,Rt.HnLordG(Midd'x
Hamilton,Marq.of(L'nd'nderry
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F.Leverton (Tynem'th)
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath,Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords. N.W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A.(Stafford,W.)
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse,RtHnH.(Somers't,E
Hope,J.F.(Sheffield, Brightside
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houston, Robert Paterson

Howard, J. (Midd.,Tottenham)
Hozier,Hon.James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Kenyon,Hon.Geo.T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col.W. (Salop.
Knowles, Sir Lees
Laurie, Lieut. General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence,Sir Joseph(Monm'th)
Lawson,JohnGrant(Yorks.N.R
Lee,ArthurH.(Hants.,Fareham
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter (Bristol,S)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Lucas, Col.Francis (Lowestoft)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Calmont, Colonel James
M'Iver,Sir Lewis(Edinburgh,W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Malcolm, Ian
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell,Rt HnSirH.E.(Wigt'n
Maxwell,W.J.H (Dumfriesshire
Milner,Rt.Hon.Sir FrederickG.
Mitchell, William (Burnley)
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan,DavidJ.(Walthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray,Rt.Hn.A.Graham(Bute
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pilkington, Colonel Richard
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Purvis, Robert

Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Ridley,Hon.M.W. (Stalybridge
Ridley, S. Forde(BethnalGreen
Ritchie,Rt.Hon.Chas.Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Samuel,SirHarry.S.(Limehouse
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos.Myles
Saunderson,Rt.Hn.Col. Edw.J.
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford,East)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley,EdwardJas.(Somerset)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent,Col.SirC.E H(Sheffield
Walrond,Rt.Hn. Sir WilliamH.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby,Lt.-Col.A.C.E.(Taunton
Whiteley,H.(Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley(York,E.R.)
Wodehouse,Lt.Hn.E.R. (Bath)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

LIQUOR TRAFFIC LOCAL VETO (SCOTLAND) BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order for Second Reading read.

MR. EUGENE WASON (Clackmannan and Kinross) formally moved the Second Reading of this Bill.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time.'

SIR FREDERICK BANBURY (Camberwell, Peckham) rose to oppose the Bill.

Debate to be resumed upon Wednesday next.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

First Report brought up, and read. Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 152.]

Adjourned at twenty-eight minutes before Six o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Monday, 2nd May, 1904.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with:—Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 1) [H.L.].

Also the Certificate that no further Standing Orders are applicable to the following Bill:—Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 1).

And also the Certificates that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with:—Thurles Urban District Council Water; Wolverhampton Corporation.

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

Scarisbrick Estate (Amendment) Bill [H.L.]. Bill, approved by the Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice, presented, on petition, and read 1^a.

West Riding Tramways Bill [H.L.]. The King's consent signified; and Bill reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

Hutchesons' Hospital and Hutchesons' Educational Trust Bill [H.L.]; South Shields Gas Bill; Chippenham Gas Bill; Sheppy Gas Bill; North Staffordshire Railway Bill; London, Tilbury, and Southend Railway Bill. Report from the Committee of Selection, That the following Lords be proposed to the House to form the Select Committee for the consideration of the said Bills; (viz.), E. Bathurst; E. Lathom; V. Falmouth; L. Clonbrock; L. Brougham and Vaux (chairman). Agreed to; and the said Lords appointed accordingly. The Committee to meet on Tuesday the 10th of May next at Eleven o'clock; and all petitions referred to the Committee, with leave to the petitioners praying to be heard by counsel against the Bills to be heard as desired, as also counsel for the Bills.

Richard Jaeger's Patent Bill [H.L.]. Read 2^a.

Norwich Water Bill. Read 3^a, and passed.

South Staffordshire Mines Drainage Bill [H.L.]; Maidenhead Bridge Bill [H.L.]. Read 3^a, and passed, and sent to the Commons.

Great Eastern Railway (Steamboats) Bill. Read 3^a, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

Great Central Railway Bill; Harrow Road and Paddington Tramways Bill; Humber Commercial Railway and Dock Bill. Brought from the Commons; read 1^a, and referred to the Examiners.

Weston-super-Mare Grand Pier Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill [H.L.] (No. 60). A Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Electric Lighting Acts, 1882 and 1888, relating to Cleveden, Portishead and Long Ashton, Crediton, Devizes, Hampton Wick and District, Houghton-le-Spring and District, the Maldens and Coombe, Northampton and District, Stroud, Nailsworth and Dursley, and Trowbridge (Urban), Bradford-on-Avon (Urban), and Bradford-on-Avon (Rural).

Water Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.] (No. 61). A Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Gas and Water Works Facilities Act, 1870, relating to Bradfield Water, Cholderton and District Water, Elham Valley Water, Frimley and Farnborough District Water, and North Sunderland Water.

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L] (No. 62). A Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Gas and Water Works Facilities Act, 1870, relating to Rainham Water, Sevenoaks Water, Southwold Water, Wetherby District Water, and Meldreth and Melbourne District Gas and Water.

Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [H.L.] (No. 63). A Bill to confirm certain

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Gas and Water Works Facilities Act, 1870, relating to Bognor Gas, Elham Valley Gas, Elstree and Boreham Wood Gas, Finedon Gas, and Godalming Gas.

Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [H.L.] (No. 64). A Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Gas and Water Works Facilities Act, 1870, relating to Gray's Gas, Hedon Gas, Northampton Gas, Rochford Gas, and Romford Gas; and

Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 3) Bill [H.L.] (No. 65). A Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Gas and Water Works Facilities Act, 1870, relating to St. Margaret's Gas, Stirling Gas, Waltham Abbey Gas, and Cheshunt Gas, Worsbroughdale and Worsbrough Gas, and Worthing Gas.

Were presented by the Lord Wolverton; read 1ª; to be printed; and referred to the Examiners.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

No. 3148. Greece (Thessaly).

No. 3149. France (Cherbourg).

No. 3150. Switzerland.

INDIA (TIBET).

I. Further Papers relating to Tibet (in continuation of [Cd. 1920.]);

II. (Royal Indian Engineering College)—

> Reports and correspondence relating to the expediency of maintaining the Royal Indian Engineering College, and other matters.
>
> Minutes of evidence taken before the Committee appointed in 1903, to inquire into the expediency of maintaining the Royal Indian Engineering College, and other matters; together with an analysis and index of the evidence.

EVICTIONS (IRELAND).

Return of evictions in Ireland, for the quarter ended 31st March, 1904.

ROYAL UNIVERSITY OF IRELAND.

Royal Warrant approving of alterations in the Statutes.

LAAD LAW (IRELAND) ACT, 1887 (EVICTION NOTICES).

Return of the number of eviction notices filed during the quarter ended 31st March, 1904.

RAILWAY RETURNS (PRELIMINARY STATEMENT).

Return relating to the railways of the United Kingdom, for the year 1903.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

BARBADOS.

Amended prison rules relating to visits and instruction of the chaplain, the officers' reward fund, and labour for juvenile offenders.

GAS COMPANIES (METROPOLIS).

Account of the metropolitan gas companies for the year 1903.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICANTS TO CHILDREN BILL [H.L.].

Amendments reported (according to order), and Bill to be read 3ª on Thursday next.

THE LIGHT LOAD-LINE.

Lord MUSKERRY: My Lords, I rise to call attention to the fact that the recommendations contained in Clause 6 of the Select Committee on the Light Load-line have not been acted upon by the Board of Trade in the spirit in which they were intended, and to the fact that the warning issued by the Board to shipowners and shipmasters as based on the recommendation contained in the second paragraph of this clause is directly opposed to the expressed opinions of the Select Committee; and to move "That, in the opinion of this House, His Majesty's Government should at once take the necessary steps in enforcing the recommendations of the Committee in a proper and effective manner."

It will be within the recollection of your Lordships that after a lengthy debate on a Bill introduced by myself, it was agreed by this House that a Select Committee should be appointed to inquire into the evils of the insufficient and improper ballasting of merchant ships. I myself have strongly advocated the compulsory adoption of a light load-line, and I do so still; but the Committee went against me on this point. They say that there is no loss of life sufficient to justify legislation of this character. I am, therefore, in the unpleasant position of awaiting the loss of further life and the attendant misery to wives and children it involves before at least the members of the Select Commitee are likely to change their views. Since their Report was promulgated further disasters have occurred through insufficient ballasting, but thanks to a merciful Providence no further lives have yet been sacrificed.

But I do not wish to dwell upon the light load-line. It is to the unanimous recommendations of the Committee that I wish to draw attention, and with your Lordships' permission I will read Clause 6 of the Select Committee's Report to which I intend to confine my further remarks, viz.—

> "Several witnesses have pointed out that many accidents are caused by the improper ballasting of ships. They have called attention to the dangers caused, first, by not securing loose ballast in the hold, and secondly, by a practice that prevails of throwing overboard loose ballast which is taken on board to make up for insufficient under-deck ballast, and is kept on deck. Such loose ballast is often thrown overboard before the ship arrives in port. The object of this practice is to prevent any unnecessary delay in the taking in of cargo.
>
> "The Committee, in view of the evidence which they have received with regard to the danger caused by the shifting of under-deck ballast, recommend that regulations as to securing ballast should be drawn up and enforced by the Board of Trade. They also deprecate most strongly the practice of throwing over ballast before a vessel arrives at her destination, and would advise the Board of Trade to issue a warning, not only to shipmasters, but also to shipowners who give orders to this effect."

There can be no uncertainty or misunderstanding about these recommendations. As a matter of fact, not one single witness before the Committee gave evidence against the necessity of securing loose ballast, or upheld in any way the pernicious practice of throwing ballast overboard at sea.

The Committee, as I have pointed out, recommended that regulations as to securing ballast should be drawn up and enforced by the Board of Trade. I lay particular stress upon the words "drawn up and enforced," because, as a matter of fact, the Marine Department of the Board of Trade have done neither. True it is that the Marine Department have issued instructions to their principal officers and surveyors calling attention to the instructions previously issued on the subject; and, to use their own words, "in the absence of any statutory authority to draw up and enforce precise regulations on the subject of ballasting," they emphasise the necessity of active supervision over vessels on the point of sailing in ballast, and over vessels taking in ballast which is particularly liable to shift. To anyone versed in shipping matters such supervision without definite regulations is of no value. In any event it is useless in cases such as the capsizing of the "Moel Tryvan," with a loss of ten lives, through the shifting of her ballast. As this ship left a Continental port, it is obvious that she was outside the supervision of the Board of Trade surveyors. Such disasters would be averted by definite regulations as recommended by the Select Committee, for they would apply to vessels bound for this country in the same way as the regulations for the proper securing of grain cargoes.

The Marine Department of the Board Trade state that they have "no statutory authority to draw up and enforce precise regulations" as recommended by the Select Committee of this House; but the concluding clause of the Committee's Report amply covers this. It is as follows—

> "The Committee therefore confidently rely upon the Board of Trade to use the powers already conferred upon them by Parliament to prevent the improper or insufficient ballasting of ships. It will be the duty of the Board to apply at once to Parliament if at any future date they consider any extension of their powers necessary in the public interest."

Therefore I voice the views of the Committee in contending that if, as the Marine Department say, they have no statutory powers to carry out the Committee's recommendations, it is their duty to at once apply to Parliament for them.

The second recommendation of the Committee is that they deprecate most strongly the practice of throwing over ballast before a vessel arrives at her destination; and consequently they advise the issue of a warning, not only to shipmasters, but to shipowners who give orders to this effect. The warning has solemnly gone forth, but it is diametrically opposed to the opinions of the Committee. Instead of condemning a dangerous practice once and for all, as the Committee had a right to expect, it is now officially authorised by the Marine Department, who say it should never be resorted to unless the ship is within easy distance of the port of destination, and in such circumstances of weather as to ensure that the vessel's seaworthiness will not be thereby affected, and that the conditions are likely to remain favourable until her arrival in port. Your Lordships will therefore perceive that the Board of Trade have sanctioned the practice of throwing ballast overboard instead of absolutely condemning it, as recommended by your Select Committee. The Marine Department of the Board in their warning have shown that, as usual, they are deplorably ignorant of the practices of ships and shipping. They expect captains of ships to be weather prophets, and they permit ballast being thrown overboard just when a vessel is in the most dangerous position, in ballast, should bad weather suddenly come on—that is, nearing the land.

I cannot do better than quote the opinions forwarded to the Board of Trade by the Merchant Service Guild, which, as representing over 10,000 captains and officers of merchant ships, should have some practical knowledge of the subject—

"As to the warning to shipowners and shipmasters of the dangers of throwing overboard ballast when at sea, the Guild can only regard this as a distinct official recognition of a mischievous practice which seems to be entirely opposed to the recommendation of the Select Committee of the House of Lords. It is palpable that shipmasters would not voluntarily throw overboard their ballast at sea, and the 'warning,' in the terms in which it is couched, simply makes them the victims should an accident happen. The Board of Trade state that the practice should never be resorted to unless the ship is within 'easy distance' of the port of destination, but it has evidently not been borne in mind that the deck hands of most of our steamers number five or six, divided into two watches. One man must be at the wheel; the officer is supposed to keep the bridge, and the rest of the watch are throwing the ballast overboard. Those conversant with the practice know that should, for instance, a steamer be leaving Cardiff for an American port in light trim, the throwing of the ballast overboard commences shortly after the time of her sailing, and it would, therefore, be difficult to judge whether 'the circumstances of weather were such as to ensure that the vessel's seaworthiness will not be thereby affected when the conditions are likely to remain favourable until her arrival in port.' The 'warning' is gravely unjust to shipmasters, who had hoped that the Board of Trade would have supported them in their difficulty by emphatically condemning the practice."

I expect to be told by my noble friend representing the Board of Trade in this House that this is another move inimical to the interests of shipowners. On occasion I have been a warm advocate of the interests of shipowners, but I cannot subordinate the safety of life to such interests.

The shipowners received the Report of the Select Committee with acclamation, simply because their interests received so much consideration. I think, therefore, that in justice to your Select Committee your Lordships should require that the two recommendations of the Committee should be carried out. The noble Lords appointed by this House to consider the matter recommended that regulations for securing loose ballast should be drawn up and enforced. This has not been carried out. The Committee have condemned the practice of throwing ballast overboard at sea. The Marine Department of the Board of Trade have now sanctioned the practice. Therefore I earnestly trust that your Lordships will not allow a Select Committee of this House to waste its labours in, after exhaustive inquiry, making important recommendations only to find them set at naught.

Moved to resolve, "That, in the opinion of this House, His Majesty's Government should at once take the necessary steps in enforcing the recommendations contained in Clause 6 of the Report of the Select Committee on the Light Load-line in a proper and effective manner."—(*Lord Muskerry.*)

LORD WOLVERTON: My Lords, in asking your Lordships to reject the Motion which has just been moved I think I shall be able to prove to the noble Earl the Leader of the Opposition, who so ably presided over the Select Committee on the Light Load-line, and to the House, that the Board of Trade have been particularly active in giving instructions in regard to this matter and have earnestly wished to carry out not only in the letter, but in the spirit, the recommendations made to them by the Select Committee. I fear that in addition to reading the Select Committee's sixth recommendation, it will be my duty also to quote Paragraph No. 10, which, of course, the Board of Trade had to read in conjunction with No. 6, for it is impossible to arrive at the true spirit of a Report without taking the whole of it into consideration. Recommendation No. 6 is as follows—

> "Several witnesses have pointed out that many accidents are caused by the improper ballasting of ships. They have called attention to the dangers caused; first, by not securing loose ballast in the hold, and secondly, by a practice that prevails of throwing overboard loose ballast which is taken on board to make up for insufficient under-deck ballast, and is kept on deck. Such loose ballast is often thrown overboard before the ship arrives in port. The object of this practice is to prevent any unnecessary delay in the taking in of cargo. The Committee, in view of the evidence which they have received with regard to the danger caused by the shifting of under-deck ballast, recommend that regulations as to securing ballast should be drawn up and enforced by the Board of Trade. They also deprecate most strongly the practice of throwing over ballast before a vessel arrives at her destination, and would advise the Board of Trade to issue a warning, not only to shipmasters, but also to shipowners who give orders to this effect."

The other paragraph to which I have referred reads—

> "The Committee feel that it would be unwise to put any further legislative restrictions upon British ships which could not equally be applied to foreign vessels, unless it could be proved that such restrictions were absolutely necessary for the safeguarding of human life."

In the course of their inquiry the Committee were made painfully aware that British shipping is subjected to considerable competition from foreign rivals using our ports. The regulations of the Board of Trade do not apply to foreign vessels entering British ports, and it was pointed out before the Committee that it was not advisable, therefore, to place more restrictions on British shipping than could possibly be helped. In those circumstances the Board of Trade were asked to issue a warning, and this they have done. The document which the Board issued is signed by Sir Francis J.S. Hopwood and Mr. Walter J. Howell, and after setting out recommendation No. 6, which I have already read to the House, it proceeds—

> "In view of these recommendations, the Board of Trade desire to call the particular attention of principal and detaining officers and surveyors to the instructions already issued respecting the improper ballasting of ships, and (in the absence of any statutory authority to draw up and enforce precise regulations on the subject of ballasting), the Department wish to strongly emphasise the necessity for the survey staff exercising an active supervision, not only over vessels on the point of sailing in ballast, but also over vessels taking in ballast of such a nature as may require exceptionally careful stowage, and may be liable to the danger of shifting when the vessel is at sea."

There are several other clauses in the warning, the last of which is to the effect that—

> "Any case in which doubt or difficulty arises should be immediately referred to the Board of Trade for special instruction."

In regard to the question of the throwing over of cargo when a ship arrives near her destination, it is necessary to allow captains of vessels a certain amount of discretion, and the Board of Trade do not desire to hamper them in carrying out their duties.

EARL SPENCER: My Lords, the Select Committee which took this matter into consideration, of which I had the honour to be the Chairman, knew that considerable interests were involved. Many of us at first sympathised with the view of the noble Lord that a light load-line should be established; but we were afterwards convinced that there was not sufficient evidence of the loss of life in ships in ballast as compared with other ships to justify such a course being taken. But we certainly did think that probably more could be done by the officers of the Board of Trade than had been done. No doubt the Board of Trade have not overlooked this matter, but have they gone far enough? I regret that they consider that they have no statutory power to make regulations with regard to the ballasting of ships, and that they have not made stronger representations to the shipowners on the question of throwing over ballast when nearing port. I hardly think that the clause referred to by Lord Wolverton can be pressed against the contention raised. Of course the Committee at the end stated that further statutory powers should be sought should the Board of Trade consider that the powers they possessed were insufficient, but probably the time has not arrived for that. The latter part of the Resolution is certainly rather strong, and I cannot advise its being pressed. With a hope that the Board of Trade will act more vigorously in the spirit of the recommendations of the Committee, I do not think the Resolution should be pressed to a division.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (The Marquess of LANSDOWNE): My Lords, I venture to express the hope that after the discussion which has taken place, and particularly after what has been said by the noble Earl opposite, the noble Lord will be content not to press his Motion to a division. The Motion is, as the noble Earl observed, a very strong one, and the speech with which the noble Lord prefaced it was even stronger than the Motion. It seems to me that both the speech and the Motion were stronger than the facts of the case required, for it has been made quite clear by the noble Lord who represents the Board of Trade that the Board have certainly not put on one side or pigeonholed the recommendations made by the Select Committee. It is quite true that the action they have taken upon it does not go quite so far as the noble Lord desired, but I think he rather strained the case when he represented the warning which the Board have issued as being diametrically opposed to the recommendations of the Committee. I gather from my noble friend beside me that the kind of regulations which the noble mover desires could not be issued without legislation, and that is, of course, as we all know, a somewhat formidable obstacle. Besides that, my noble friend mentioned one very important consideration, of which we ought not to lose sight—namely, that regulations of this kind, hampering as they must do to some extent the freedom of persons engaged in mercantile business, tend to increase the disadvantages with which British shipowners have to contend in their competition with foreign rivals—a consideration that has been brought home to us at many points in recent years. I hope, therefore, that the noble Lord, having called attention to the subject and having elicited from the Board of Trade a distinct statement that the matter is one of which they are not losing sight, will be content with this discussion and not press his Motion to a division.

*LORD MUSKERRY: My Lords, I fully expected that my Motion would meet with opposition. I do not remember ever having brought forward a Motion dealing with shipping which was not opposed. I may say that I know at whose hands the opposition comes; "the voice is the voice of Jacob, but the hands are the hands of Esau." I desire to protect the shipmasters from themselves. They are left no discretion and by the pressure of owners are compelled, in order to save time and expense, to throw over ballast at the risk of loss of life. Not a single witness who gave evidence before the Committee upheld the practice of throwing over ballast at sea, and it is well known that it is a very dangerous practice. Why is it done? Just to save the shipowner the few shillings that the discharge of the ballast would cost when the vessel is safe in port. I am afraid that, unless they are made to do it, the Marine Department of the Board of Trade will not carry out the recommendations of the Committee; but, acting on the advice of the noble Marquess and the noble Earl opposite, I will not press my Motion.

*LORD ELLENBOROUGH: My Lords, I should like to say one word as to the hardship of always fining the merchant captain. Why are the shipowners never fined? When there is a railway accident the shareholders are fined through the substantial compensation which is granted; and I trust that in the near future, legislation will be passed under which shipowners may be fined instead of the shipmasters.

Motion, by leave of the House, withdrawn.

SEA FISHERIES BILL [H.L.].

Bill read 3ª (according to order).

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES (The Earl of ONSLOW): The object of the Amendment standing in my name is to enable the Royal Irish Constabulary and the Dublin Metropolitan Police to act under the Bill. I have been asked to add to the Amendment as it appears on the Paper the following words: "The reference to a fishery officer appointed under the——"

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (The Earl of HALSBURY): The noble Earl cannot do that without notice.

THE EARL OF ONSLOW: Then I move the Amendment as it stands on the Paper.

Amendment moved—

"At the end of Clause 1, to add, as a new subsection, the words 'Any member of the Royal Irish Constabulary or of the Dublin Metropolitan Police may, with the consent of the Lord-Lieutenant, be appointed as an officer for the purposes of this section, subject to such orders and restrictions as may be made with the approval of the Lord-Lieutenant, in the case of a member of the Royal Irish Constabulary, by the Inspector-General thereof, and in the case of a member of the Dublin Metropolitan Police, by the Chief Commissioner thereof.'"—(*The Earl of Onslow.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Bill passed and sent to the Commons.

House adjourned at ten minutes past Five o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 2nd May, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz:—Barnard Castle Gas Bill [Lords]. Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time.

Barry Railway (Extension of Time, etc.) Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment.

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill. As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

Southport and Lytham Tramroad (Extension of Time) Bill [Lords]. Read a second time, and committed.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill. Read the third time, and passed.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill. Read a second time, and committed.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No 6). Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the County Palatine of Lancaster and the Counties of Rutland and Surrey, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Grant Lawson and Mr. Walter Long.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill. "To confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the County Palatine of Lancaster and the Counties of Rutland and Surrey," presented, and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 168.]

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 7). Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to Godalming, Haworth, Northallerton, and Tipton, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Grant Lawson and Mr. Walter Long.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill. "To confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to Godalming, Haworth, Northallerton, and Tipton," presented, and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 169.]

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8). Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to Kingswood, West Ham and the Knighton and Teme, the North-East Durham, and the South Shields Rural and Southwick-on-Wear, Joint Hospital Districts, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Grant Lawson and Mr. Walter Long.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill. "To confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Covernment Board relating to Kingswood, West Ham and the Knighton and Teme, the North-East Durham, and the South Shields Rural and Southwick-on-Wear, Joint Hospital Districts," presented, and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 170.]

Local Government Provisional Orders (Gas). Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to East Dereham and Neyland, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Grant Lawson and Mr. Walter Long.

Local Government Provisional Orders (Gas) Bill. "To confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to East Dereham and Neyland," presented, and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 171.]

Liverpool and London and Globe Insurance Company Bill [Lords] [Stamp Duties]. Committee to consider of authorising the imposition of a certain Stamp Duty in lieu of the Stamp Duties which would have been payable upon the deeds or assurances which, in case the Bill had not been passed into an Act, would have been required to pass to and vest in the company certain property (King's Recommendation signified), To-morrow.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—Great Northern and City Railway (Extension of Time) Bill; Corbridge Gas Bill, without Amendment.

Hampton-in-Arden Gas Bill, with Amendments.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confirm and give effect to arrangements between the Corporation of Manchester and the Manchester Ship Canal Company with respect to the financial relations between the two bodies and to empower the Manchester Ship Canal Company to raise further money by borrowing and to create additional capital; and for other purposes." [Manchester Ship Canal (Finance) Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill intituled, "An Act to authorise the Urban District Council of Ebbw Vale to construct additional waterworks; and for other purposes." [Ebbw Vale Urban District Water Bill [Lords.]

And, also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to authorise the Urban District Council of Shipley to purchase the gas undertaking of Sir Titus Salt, Bart., Sons, and Company, Limited, and to acquire land, construct street works, consolidate their loans and borrow money; and for other purposes." [Shipley Urban District Council Bill [Lords.]

Manchester Ship Canal (Finance) Bill [Lords]; Ebbw Vale Urban District Water Bill [Lords]; Shipley Urban District Council Bill [Lords]. Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

PETITIONS.

HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES, ETC., BILL.

Petition from Battersea, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions against; from Aberdeen (two); Forest Gate; Gloucester; High Ham; Barrowford; London; and Walworth; to lie upon the Table.

LICENCES (RENEWAL).

Petitions against alteration of Law: from Battersea (two); Walworth; St. Pancras; Bolton; Somerton (two); Corris; and Cambridge; to lie upon the Table.

PUBLIC HOUSES (CLOSING DURING ELECTIONS).

Petition from South Ockendon, for legislation; to lie upon the Table.

RATING OF MACHINERY BILL.

Petition from Battersea, against; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF BUTTER BILL.

Petition from Grantham, against; to lie upon the Table.

TRADES UNIONS AND TRADES DISPUTES BILL.

Petition from Battersea, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

TRADES UNIONS AND TRADE DISPUTES (No. 2) BILL.

Petition from Battersea, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION BILL.

Petition from Battersea, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS. ETC.

BARBADOS.

Copy presented, of Amended Prison Rules relating to Visits and Instruction of the Chaplain, the Officers' Reward Fund, and Labour for Juvenile Prisoners [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

RAILWAY RETURNS (PRELIMINARY STATEMENT).

Copy presented, of Return relating to the railways of the United Kingdom for the year 1903 (Preliminary Statement) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

GAS COMPANIES (METROPOLIS).

Copy presented, of Accounts of the Metropolitan Gas Companies for the year 1903 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 153.]

EAST INDIA (TIBET).

Copy presented, of Further Papers relating to Tibet (in continuation of C. 1920) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

EAST INDIA (ROYAL INDIAN ENGINEERING COLLEGE).

Copy presented, of Minutes of Evidence taken before the Committee appointed in 1903 to inquire into the expediency of maintaining the Royal Indian Engineering College, and other matters, together with an analysis and index of the evidence [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

EAST INDIA (ROYAL INDIAN ENGINEERING COLLEGE).

Copy presented, of Reports and Correspondence relating to the expediency of maintaining the Royal Indian Engineering College, and other matters [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3148 to 3150 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (MISCELLANEOUS SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Miscellaneous Series, No. 608 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

CROWN AGENTS.

Address for "Return showing the total amount, including loans, on which any commission was charged or received by the Crown Agents for the Colonies during each of the last five years, differentiating between (1) commercial, railway, and general business; and (2) financial, loan, and miscellaneous business; also the total amount of commission charged or received in each year; and also the separate totals debited and commission charged to each Colony and Protectorate in each of the said years."—(*Mr. Austin Taylor.*)

WOOLLEN, WORSTED, AND SHODDY FACTORIES (INSPECTION).

Address for "Return of the number of Woollen, Worsted, and Shoddy Factories subject to inspection under the Factory and Workshop Act, 1901, and the number of spindles, looms, and other machines used in such factories."—(*Mr. Wanklyn.*)

EVICTIONS (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Return of the number of Evictions in Ireland for the quarter ended 31st March, 1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LAND LAW (IRELAND) ACT, 1887 (EVICTION NOTICES).

Copy presented, of Return of Eviction Notices filed during the quarter ended 31st March, 1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

ROYAL UNIVERSITY OF IRELAND.

Copy presented, of Royal Warrant approving of alterations in the Statutes [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

IRISH LAND COMMISSION (RULES).

Copy presented, of Rules made in pursuance of Section 88, Sub-section 5, of the Irish Land Act, 1903, dated 23rd April, 1904 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Post Office Officials.

MR. THORNTON (Clapham): To ask the Postmaster-General whether his attention has been called to the fact that a copyist recently employed in the General Post Office, and who is now sixty-four years of age, has quite recently been promoted to be an assistant clerk (abstractor class) without examination, although he had failed in his examination, for a like position, in 1893; and whether he can explain the action of the Post Office, with the sanction of the Treasury, in compulsorily retiring a senior assistant clerk in the Post Office at the age of sixty-one on a pension of 15s. a week.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) It was recently found desirable to absorb as many as possible of the few men copyists remaining in the Post Office by appointing them to the class of assistant clerks. As the change was for the advantage of the service no examination was imposed. One of the officers thus treated is sixty-four years of age. The case of the assistant clerk to whom the hon. Member refers as having been retired at the age of sixty-one was carefully considered by my predecessor, who decided that his retention in the service would not be in the public interest. I see no grounds for dissenting from this decision.

Female Learners in Post Offices.

SIR JOHN LENG (Dundee): To ask the Postmaster-General if he will say whether there is any recognised limit of the length of time that female learners, after becoming fully qualified, may be retained at the rate of 5s. per week before being appointed on the establishment; and whether, seeing that in several large provincial post offices there are a number of fully qualified female clerks receiving wages on which they cannot subsist, he will arrange that, until appointments are provided for them on the establishment, fewer learners will be taken into such offices.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) There is no fixed limit of time. Appointments to the establishment must necessarily depend on the occurrence of vacancies. The usual practice is not to appoint learners unless it may be expected that they will be appointed to an established post within two years. Where it is found that the occurrence of vacancies on the establishment is less frequent than was anticipated steps are taken to restrict the number of learners.

Pensions of Temporary Clerks.

MR. THORNTON: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury, in view of the fact that service rendered by certificated temporary clerks prior to 19th August, 1871, has been considered by the Government as equivalent to registered copyists' service for the purposes of the Treasury Minute of December, 1886, for bonus and gratuity on retirement, whether such service will be considered also equivalent to temporary copyists' service for the purposes of the Treasury Minute of 1st June, 1882; if not, and in view of the fact that both the temporary clerks and temporary copyists entered the service under the same conditions as to pension, and that the service of the temporary clerks commenced at a date even prior to that of the temporary copyists, whether such cases will be dealt with under Clause 3 of the Superannuation Act of 1887.

(*Answered by Mr. Victor Cavendish.*) The operation of the Treasury Minute of the 1st June, 1882, is expressly limited to the class known as "Writers," and I see no ground for extending it to other classes: As regards the application of Section 3 of the Superannuation Act of 1887, I am unable to make any general statement. Every case must be considered on its merits.

The Bail Act.

MR. LLOYD MORGAN (Carmarthenshire, W.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the fact that the Bail Act, 1898, which empowers justices to dispense with sureties (if such course is not likely to defeat the ends of justice) in cases where a prisoner is committed for trial has produced only a very slight effect; and whether, in order to prevent prisoners, who are afterwards acquitted, from having been kept in prison to await their trial, he will consider the question of again bringing the provisions of the Bail Act under the notice of justices and their clerks.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) The hon. Member will find some figures on this subject on page 22 of the Judicial Statistics for 1902. The Act quoted appears to have had some appreciable effect, for the percentage of prisoners released on bail pending trial has increased since the passing of the Act by nearly a fourth. This, I think, is a satisfactory result, for it must be remembered that the proportion of prisoners sent for trial who have no respectable friends willing to go bail for them, and who, nevertheless, could be released on their own recognisance without risk of failure of justice must necessarily be small. As the provisions of the Act are now well known, and as no evidence of any general reluctance to grant bail and no complaints of refusal to do so in individual cases reach the Home Office, I do not think that it is necessary for me to make any further communication in this matter to justices or their clerks.

Licences Refused but Renewed on Appeal to Quarter Sessions.

MR. COHEN (Islington, E.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he will state the number of licences in each of the counties of England and Wales, and London separately, the renewal of which has been refused by the licensing justices in each of the years 1894 to 1903, and which have been renewed on appeal to quarter sessions.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) The following table gives the number of cases (arranged in counties as desired by my hon. friend) in which quarter sessions have reversed the decision of licensing justices in regard to the renewal of licences, so far as is shown by the Parliamentary Returns on the subject:—Statement of the number of licences in each of the Counties of England and Wales, and London separately, the renewal of which has been refused by the licensing justices in the years 1894 to 1903, and which have been renewed on appeal to quarter sessions.

	1894.	1895.	1896.	1897.	1898.	1900.	1903.	Total.
Bedford	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1
Berks	—	1	—	—	—	—	1	2
Bucks	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Cambridge	—	—	—	—	—	2	2	4
Chester	4	—	4	—	—	1	2	11
Cornwall	—	—	—	1	—	1	—	2
Cumberland	—	1	—	—	3	—	6	10
Derby	—	—	—	—	—	1	2	3
Devon	—	2	1	1	2	—	3	9
Dorset	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Durham	—	1	2	—	1	—	26	30
Essex	1	—	—	—	1	—	—	2

	1894.	1895.	1896.	1897.	1898.	1900.	1903.	Total.
Gloucester	—	—	1	—	—	—	4	5
Hereford	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Herts	1	—	—	—	—	—	1	2
Huntingdon	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Kent	1	2	—	—	2	1	9	15
Lancaster	10	3	4	6	8	12	20	63
Leicester	—	1	—	—	—	1	1	3
Lincoln	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
London	12	4	10	13	6	9	9	63
Middlesex	3	1	1	—	—	5	2	12
Monmouth	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	1
Norfolk	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Northampton	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Northumberland	3	2	—	2	—	—	—	7
Nottingham	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	1
Oxford	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	2
Rutland	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Salop	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1
Somerset	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1
Southampton	—	1	2	1	—	1	3	8
Stafford	6	1	2	3	—	—	8	20
Suffolk	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Surrey	1	—	—	—	—	1	2	4
Sussex	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Warwick	1	2	1	—	1	3	11	19
Westmorland	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Wilts	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Worcester	1	—	1	1	1	2	1	7
York, East Riding	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	3
York, West Riding	14	1	—	—	2	—	4	21
York, North Riding	4	1	2	2	—	—	8	17
Anglesey	—	—	—	—	—	—	4	4
Brecon	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Cardigan	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	1
Carmarthen	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	2
Carnarvon	—	—	—	—	—	—	10	10
Denbigh	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
Flint	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Glamorgan	1	—	—	2	1	2	8	14
Merioneth	—	—	—	—	—	1	2	3
Montgomery	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Pembroke	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1
Radnor	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Totals	65	24	32	32	29	45	159	386

N.B.—The figures for the years 1899 and 1901 are not available, and in 1902 there were no General Annual Licensing Meetings outside London.

Gun Sights of H.M.S. "Centurion."

MR. YERBURGH (Chester): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether, in view of the fact that the Admiralty would not have sent the "Centurion" to China if they did not consider her fit to go into action, the efficiency of the gun sights of H.M.S. "Centurion" was certified by the officers of H.M.S. "Excellent;" and, if not, what were the reasons that led the Admiralty to suppose that the "Centurion" was fit to go into action.

(*Answered by Mr. Pretyman.*) I have nothing to add to my reply to the hon. Member for King's Lynn of 18th February last,† to which I must refer my hon. friend.

Cost of Raising of Submarine A 1.

SIR JOHN LENG: To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he will state what sum has been, or will be, paid to the Neptune Salvage Company of Stockholm for raising the A 1 Submarine, distinguishing the amount contracted for and extras; was the plan of making the hull tight and pumping in air the proposal of the Salvage Company or the Admiralty; for how many days was the pneumatic pumping system continued; when was it resolved to lift the vessel in the ordinary way; and what length of time was occupied in raising her after the pneumatic system was abandoned.

(*Answered by Mr. Pretyman.*) The sum due to the Salvage Company is £2,650; there are no extras. The plan of making the hull tight and pumping in air was the proposal of the Salvage Company, and was fitted and carried out by them on their own responsibility. The pneumatic pumping system was continued the whole time, from beginning to end, until she was placed safely in dock by the Salvage Company and was never abandoned. The lifting alluded to was simply an accessory to the pneumatic system.

State Registration of Nurses.

DR. THOMPSON (Monaghan, N.): To ask the President of the Local Government Board if he will consent to appoint a small Select Committee to consider the advisability of the State registration of nurses.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) The subject of nursing generally is not within the province of my Department, which is only concerned with it as respects nursing in Poor Law institutions. I am not in a position to give the consent asked for in the Question.

Educational Authorities neglecting to carry out the Education Act, 1902.

MR. ALFRED DAVIES (Carmarthen Boroughs): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education if he will state the names of the educational authorities in England and Wales against which complaints are alleged for not carrying out the duties of the Education Act, 1902; and if he now purposes holding any other inquiry than that of the Carmarthen County Council.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) As to the first part of the hon. Member's Question, it does not seem desirable that the Board should publish every complaint which may be addressed to them for real or supposed failure on the part of local education authorities to carry out the duties of the Education Act. As to the second part, the Board do not for the moment propose to hold another inquiry.

Income-Tax Collection in England and Scotland.

SIR J. STIRLING-MAXWELL (Glasgow College): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, in view of the fact that he is not prepared to publish the monthly Returns of income-tax collection, he will state whether the difference between the systems of collection in England and Scotland results in the tax being collected earlier in England or in Scotland.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) As the amount to be collected in England is about nine times the amount to be collected in Scotland, and as the number of assessments in England is about seven times the number in Scotland, it is scarcely possible that the collection in England could under any circumstances be completed quite as soon as in Scotland.

Coal Exports.

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he will give, for the three months ending 31st March last, the quantities of coal exported at declared values not exceeding 5s., exceeding 5s. but not exceeding 6s., exceeding 6s. but not exceeding 7s., exceeding 7s. but not exceeding 8., and exceeding 8s. per ton; if his attention has been called to the fact that, during the quarter ending 31st December, 1903, the quantity of coal exported at values between 6s. and 7s. was less than 12 per cent. of the quantity shipped at values between 5s. and 6s., and less than 25 per cent. of the quantity shipped at values between 7s. and 8s. per ton; and whether the Customs authorities attribute the smaller quantity shipped between 6s. and 7s. to the remission of the shilling duty on coal exported at a price not exceeding 6s. per ton.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxx., 239.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) The quantity of coal exported during the three months ended 31st March last at a value not exceeding 5s. per ton was 334,782 tons; exceeding 5s. but not exceeding 6s. per ton, 944,413; exceeding 6s. but not exceeding 7s. per ton, 88,597; exceeding 7s. but not exceeding 8s. per ton, 707,897; exceeding 8s. per ton, 8,431,180. The Board of Customs have no official information as to the reason why smaller quantities are shipped at values between 6s. and 7s. per ton, and the explanation may be to some extent a matter of opinion. But I have no doubt that the cause suggested by the hon. Member has much to do with it.

The National Debt.

MR. McCRAE (Edinburgh, E.): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he will state the basis of calculation on which the estimate of £6,600,000 as the contribution to the Sinking Fund for the reduction of the National Debt was made for the financial year 1903–4, in view of the fact that a sum of only £5,149,000 appears to have been so applied.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) The amount actually issued to the National Debt Commissioners for repayment of the capital of the Debt, consisting (1) of the portion of the Terminable Annuities, representing principal; and (2) of the "New Sinking Fund," amounted in all to £6,509,932, as against the estimate of £6,600,000 given by the Chancellor of the Exchequer a year ago. If we leave out of account the Transvaal repayment of £3,000,000, which was applied in extinction of Exchequer Bonds, the total "dead weight" debt was reduced within the year by £5,149,000. This, however, is the net sum. The reduction would have been £2,000,000 more, had it not been that a temporary advance of that amount was obtained from the Bank of England at the end of the year to strengthen the Exchequer balance. The balance had been temporarily depleted to that extent by issues to meet expenditure on capital account, which the National Debt Commissioners were unable to replace within the year. It must be remembered that the amount by which the Debt is reduced in the year can never correspond with the amount of money applied in redemption of debt, because a given amount of cash will cancel either a larger or smaller amount of stock according as the stock stands below or above par, and because it seldom happens that the National Debt Commissioners are able to apply all the money issued to them within the year.

Value of Licensed Premises.

MR. PEEL (Manchester, S.): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer by what method and on what scale is the value of licensed premises, referred to in Clause 2 of the Licensing Bill of 1904, determined by the Commissioners of Inland Revenue for the purpose of estate duty.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) I will consider whether I can lay a Paper giving the desired information.

Alcohol for Manufacturing Purposes.

SIR ERNEST FLOWER (Bradford, W.): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he will consider the possibility of allowing alcohol used for manufacturing purposes in the United Kingdom (such as the production of artificial dyes) to be freed from the payment of duty.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) Section 8 of The Finance Act, 1902, authorises the Commissioners of Inland Revenue to permit the use of duty-free spirits in any art or manufacture in which it can be proved to their satisfaction that the use of methylated spirits would be unsuitable or detrimental. Under this section the Commissioners have already granted permission for the use of duty-free spirits in a number of cases, and any further applications will be carefully considered.

Imports of Impure Teas.

SIR SEYMOUR KING (Hull, Central): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether his attention has recently been called to the fact that the importation into the United States and Australia of low-grade, impure, and unwholesome teas has been stopped by legislation; whether he is aware that quantities of teas which have been rejected by the Customs authorities in those countries have been and are being shipped to this country, and, together with quantities of similar low quality teas imported direct, are being employed here for mixing with superior teas without incurring the penalties for adulteration under existing laws; and, if so, whether he will consider if, without disadvantage to the Revenue, he can introduce similar regulations for the exclusion of such teas from this country.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) Only one case has been brought to my knowledge of the importation into this country of tea rejected in the United States or Australia. The legislation in the United States to which the hon. Member refers requires that imported tea should come up to certain selected standard samples. The terms of the Australian Law appear to correspond closely with the law in this country, which provides for the seizure or destruction of any tea which is either exhausted or mixed with other substances or unfit for human food, and in pursuance of the Customs regulations over 66,000 lbs. of tea were condemned in 1903. I do not think that any alteration in the existing system is required.

Irish Congested Districts.

DR. THOMPSON: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if his attention has been drawn to the fact that application to schedule certain poor districts in Ireland as congested districts has been refused; and, if so, will he state what action he proposes to take in the matter, in view of the provisions of the Land Act of 1903.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) Congestion outside the scheduled districts can be dealt with under the Land Act of 1903. I refer the hon. Member to Section 6 (4) and (5), Section 7, Section 12, Section 21, and Section 75 of that Act.

Yeomanry Drill.

COLONEL WYNDHAM-QUIN (Glamorganshire, S.): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether the drill, as now taught at the Yeomanry School of Instruction, Aldershot, differs considerably from that laid down in the last published edition of the Yeomanry drill book; and, if so, whether it is intended to issue a revised drill book to the regiments of Imperial Yeomanry for their use during the current year.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) The drill taught at the School of Instruction for Imperial Yeomanry Officers does not differ from that laid down in the last published Imperial Yeomany Training (1902), but Section 29, which contains "Troop Drill," has been amplified in order to thoroughly explain it. A revise of the book is now in course of preparation, but I am afraid that it may not be ready for issue in time for the current year's training.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Suggested Naval Reserve Battery at Fraserburgh.

MR. MACONOCHIE (Aberdeenshire, E.): I beg to ask the Civil Lord of the Admiralty if he can now say if it is intended to place a Naval Reserve battery at Fraserburgh, Scotland.

*THE CIVIL LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARTHUR LEE, Hampshire, Fareham): The establishment of a Royal Naval Reserve battery at Fraserburgh depends on whether the fishermen in the neighbourhood come forward in sufficient numbers to justify the expense of erecting one. A final decision has not yet been arrived at as the requisite number of eligible men have not come forward up to the present.

Pay of Army Nurses.

Dr. FARQUHARSON (Aberdeenshire, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he has been able to effect any improvement in the pay and position of the Army nurses.

The SECRETARY of STATE for WAR (Mr. Arnold-Forster, Belfast, W.): A Royal Warrant will shortly be issued under which the salary of a nurse is fixed at £40 a year, rising to £45 a year, instead of £30 to £35 as at present; whilst the pay of the higher classes of sister, matron, and principal matron are correspondingly increased. Under the new regulations the matron-in-chief will receive £300 a year, rising to £350. The pensions depend on the rates of pay, and are accordingly increased in proportion.

Scottish Army Chaplains.

Captain ELLICE (St. Andrews Burghs) I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in appointing Scotch Army Presbyterian chaplains, he will endeavour to give to the Scottish Free Churches their fair share of such appointments.

Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The existing commissioned Presbyterian Chaplains belong to the Established Church of Scotland, the United Free Church of Scotland, and the Irish Presbyterian Church. The soldier's attestation form, on which his religion is stated, does not distinguish between the various sects of Presbyterianism, and it is not therefore possible to arrive at a division of Presbyterian Chaplains' commissions based on the proportionate strength of these three sects in the Army. But I can assure the hon. and gallant Member that there is every desire to make these appointments in such a way as to ensure that each of the recognised creeds should be adequately represented in the Army.

War Office Reconstitution.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can state what will be the financial effect at the War Office of the adoption of the recommendations of the Reconstitution Committee, bearing in mind the increase in the non-effective charges by the enforced retirement of officers on the headquarter staff with some time yet to serve.

Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I am not at present in a position to give any reply to this Question, but I hope to have an opportunity later on of giving this information in connection with a statement on the general reorganisation. I hardly know to what officers the hon. Member refers.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT: The Military Secretary and the Adjutant-General.

Destruction of Food Supplies during South African War.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state the money value of food supplies which were destroyed as unfit for use during the South African campaign; and whether any of the loss has been made good by the contractors who provided such supplies.

Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I assume the hon. Member refers to the period subsequent to the cessation of hostilities as well as to the actual campaign. Records have not been kept of the smaller losses, but the principal losses are as follows:—For the period from August, 1901, to the termination of the war in May, 1902—£29,567. For the period subsequent to this date, up to March last—£402,278. Where the contractors' liability has been established, they have made good the losses. The value of the supplies thus made good is £31,517. Of the £402,278 above referred to, the liability for the sum of £94,336 is still under the consideration of the law officers.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): And how many of these contractors are Members of this House?

[No answer was returned.]

Imperial Yeomanry.

Mr. SEYMOUR ORMSBY-GORE (Lincolnshire, Gainsborough): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state the number of actual members of the Yeomanry forces who joined the Imperial Yeomanry for active service during the late war; and also what was the number of Volunteers enrolled in that force during the war.

Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The numbers of Yeomanry and Volunteers who joined the Imperial Yeomanry for service in South Africa, are, according to the quarterly returns, as follows: Yeomanry, 2,789; Volunteers, 6,209.

The Guards' Cap.

Sir CARNE RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether it is proposed to introduce another new service cap for the Foot Guards.

Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: No, Sir. No such change is in contemplation by the Army Council.

Purchases for the Transvaal through the Crown Agents.

Mr. ROSE (Cambridgeshire, Newmarket): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the system of purchases of supplies for the Transvaal through the Crown Agents of the Colonies includes requirements for such works as tramways, electric lighting, and roads for the municipalities of Pretoria and Johannesburg, or only requirements for Government Departments.

The SECRETARY of STATE for the COLONIES (Mr. Lyttelton, Warwick and Leamington): The system applies only to requirements for Government Departments and not to those for the municipalities.

Transvaal Administration and the Crown Agents.

Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL (Yorkshire, Cleveland): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, in view of the fact that it is the declared policy of the Government to treat the Transvaal as a self-governing colony in all matters in which Imperial interests are not concerned, he will reconsider his decision to restrict the Transvaal Government to the Agents for the Crown Colonies in the purchase of supplies; whether this decision was on the advice of Lord Milner; and whether he will present to this House the correspondence which has passed on this subject, including any resolutions of protest adopted by chambers of commerce and other bodies in South Africa.

Mr. LYTTELTON: His Majesty's Government entirely adhere to their declared policy to treat the Transvaal as a self-governing colony in all matters in which Imperial interests are not concerned. Having regard to the Imperial guarantee of the Transvaal Loan, Imperial interests are concerned in the financial administration of the Transvaal. I propose to await the arrival of the resolutions of the chambers of commerce, and to give them full consideration. No evidence is yet before me which leads me to suppose that the general taxpayers in the Transvaal are, with knowledge of the facts, dissatisfied with the existing system which, in my judgment, operates to their advantage in respect both to economy and efficiency. Until such evidence is forthcoming I see no reason to reconsider the decision arrived at by my predecessor in this matter, in which I entirely concur and to which I have given effect. Lord Milner has accepted the practice under which imported supplies from England required for the Colonies are indented for through the Crown Agents. I will consider the question of presenting the correspondence when I have received the resolutions referred to, and, as at present advised, I see no objection to doing so.

Mr. AUSTIN TAYLOR (Liverpool, East Toxteth): May I ask if the Transvaal Government is at liberty to purchase any supplies from representatives of foreign manufacturers on the spot, or have they to treat with the Crown Agents for those supplies?

Mr. LYTTELTON said he was not able, without notice, to speak of the practice referred to, but, as a general rule, articles required at urgent notice might be purchased on the spot.

South African Census.

Major SEELY (Isle of Wight): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can now state what is the total estimated adult male white population of the Transvaal and Orange River Colonies.

Mr. LYTTELTON: The results of the census which was taken on 17th April have not yet been communicated to me and can hardly as yet be available, but I have asked that I may have them at an early date.

Major SEELY: When may we expect to have them?

Mr. LYTTELTON: The census was only taken on 17th April and the figures are not yet tabulated.

Major SEELY: It is very important we should have the figures as soon as possible. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman can obtain some estimate?

Mr. LYTTELTON: I will consider that.

White Labour in the Transvaal Mines.

Major SEELY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can explain why the proportion of white men employed in the Transvaal mines is half as large again as that which existed in the period before the South African War.

Mr. LYTTELTON: The explanation given by the mining engineers in their statement presented to the Secretary of State in January, 1903, will be found at page 340 of Cd. 1895. They point out that the white staff of a mine in its general departments cannot be materially reduced though it may not be working at its full capacity, and the same cause is still in operation though to a reduced extent.

Chinese Labour in the Transvaal Mines.

Mr. H. J. WILSON (Yorkshire, W.R., Holmfirth): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is aware that under the late Boer Government in the Transvaal no coloured person was allowed to finish the preparation of the holes and to fire the charges for blasting in the mines, these operations being performed by white labour; and whether the omission of the word "miner" from the list of trades (Schedule 1, Cd. 1941), from which the indentured Chinese in the Transvaal are to be debarred, will remove the above restriction and enable the mine-owners to employ Chinese to perform the operations mentioned, and thus to dispense entirely with the services of white miners.

Mr. LYTTELTON: The indentured Chinese are restricted under the Ordinance to unskilled work in the mines such as is usually performed by natives. This restriction would appear to exclude the Chinese from work of the class in which white men have hitherto been engaged.

Mr. H. J. WILSON: Why was the word "miner" omitted?

Mr. LYTTELTON: I have not the Order before me.

Mr. FENWICK (Northumberland, Wansbeck): May I ask if the imported Chinaman, although he is not permitted to do machine drilling, may do hand drilling.

Mr. LYTTELTON: The hon. Gentleman asks me rather a highly technical Question. I do not think I can give a better test offhand than to say that the operations in which natives have usually been engaged are the measure of the unskilled work. That unskilled work may be done by the Chinese. Nothing else can be done.

[No answer was returned.]

Jamaica—Excise Match Duty.

Mr. McKENNA (Monmouthshire, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been drawn to the statement in the Report of the Governor of Jamaica that it is clear that the single match factory working in the island still enjoys a considerable amount of protection at the expense of the general revenue and the consumers of matches; and whether he can state what public services the owner of this factory has rendered which entitle him to this favour.

MR. LYTTELTON: The present Excise duty on matches in Jamaica was established by a Colonial ordinance of 1901. The Secretary of State pointed out at the time that the duty was not as high as had been recommended by Sir David Barbour. I do not regard the present position of this question as wholly satisfactory, and am communicating with the Governor on the subject.

The Mission to Tibet.

MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India if the Tibetan Expedition has yet been recognised by the Dalai Lama, or if he has any information to show that the expedition will have to advance beyond Gyangtse.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): The hon. Member will have seen from the Viceroy's telegram of the 25th April, which has been published in the newspapers, that the Chinese Amban has written from Lhasa to Colonel Younghusband, expressing the intention of proceeding to Gyangtse accompanied by a representative of the Tibetan Government. Beyond this information, I have nothing to add to the answer I gave a similar Question by the hon. Member on Monday last.†

MR. LAMBERT: Is the Amban recognised by the Dalai Lama?

MR. BRODRICK: I presume so, as he is to be accompanied by a Tibetan representative.

The Somali Mullah and the Mijertain Tribe.

MR. LAMBERT: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the Mijertain tribe, with which the Somaliland Mullah is fighting, is a tribe under British protection; and whether the fact that the Mullah being thus engaged is consonant with the Government's information that the Mullah's power is broken.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Earl PERCY, Kensington, S.): The Mijertain tribe are not under British protection. The fact that they have attacked the Mullah is rather a confirmation than otherwise of the information to which the hon. Member refers.

MR. LAMBERT: Is the power of the Mullah broken?

EARL PERCY: I have said the fact that this tribe have dared to attack the Mullah goes rather to show his power is broken.

British Garrison for Somaliland.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether it is intended to occupy any portion of Somaliland by a military force; and, if so, for how long, and what the extent and cost of the force is to be.

EARL PERCY: The question of the numerical strength of the force which it will be necessary to maintain in the protectorate after the withdrawal of the expedition is under the consideration of His Majesty's Government, and no announcement of their decision can at present be made.

Illig.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE (Bristol E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the force of British soldiers and sailors who captured a fort at Illig, in Italian Somaliland, in the presence, but without the help, of Italian forces, did so under orders from home; whether the place so captured was immediately handed over to the Italian authorities; and whether it is intended to continue these operations in a foreign possession.

EARL PERCY: The answer to the first paragraph of the hon. Member's Question is in the affirmative. Illig will be placed in the hands of a tribe whose loyalty commands the confidence of the Italian Government, and no further operations are contemplated.

Licensed Premises, Valuation for Estate Duty.

*MR. ASHTON (Bedfordshire, Luton): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he will state in what manner and on what basis the Commissioners of Inland Revenue value an estate, and more especially premises licensed for the sale of liquor, for the purpose of estate duty.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxxiii., 1045.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): There is a Question on the Paper for to-morrow in the name of the hon. Member for East Somerset, asking for this information in the shape of a Paper to be laid upon the Table of the House. Perhaps that will be the most appropriate manner for dealing with it, and I will consider by to-morrow whether it is possible to grant the Paper.

MR. LAMBERT: Will the Paper be available before the Second Reading of the Licensing Bill.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I must not be taken as giving a pledge, as I am considering if I can lay a Paper; but if the information is to be given in that form I will endeavour to have it ready before the Second Reading of the Licensing Bill.

*MR. ASHTON: Can the right hon. Gentleman say if the value of a licensed house is generally based on the estimated annual rental value multiplied by so many years purchase?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I am quite unable to answer that Question without notice.

British Steamship Service to East Africa.

MR. EVELYN CECIL (Aston Manor): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, in view of the fact that His Majesty's Government have assented in principle to the policy of subsidising a direct British steamship service to East Africa, and intimated that a Committee would be appointed to consider the details, he can now state the terms of the reference to the Committee and the names of its members.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The Government, as stated in the Question, have assented in principle to the recommendation of the Select Committee on Steamship Subsidies in regard to a British service to East Africa. It is obvious that this recommendation cannot be acted upon in the present state of the finances, but in the meantime the Government propose to appoint an Inter-Departmental Committee to work out the details. I am not yet in a position to give the names of the members of the Committee, but it will be composed of representatives of the Treasury, Foreign Office, Colonial Office, Admiralty, Board of Trade, India Office, and Post Office. The reference will be: "To inquire and report (1) what conditions should be prescribed for such a service; (2) what subsidy is likely to be required; and (3) what contributions may be expected from the British possessions or protectorates interested in the scheme." The Committee will also be at liberty to make any suggestions or recommendations on the subject generally which do not fall under the above heads.

MR. BUCHANAN (Perthshire, E.): Is it proposed to make India pay for this service?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: We shall invite the India Office to consider the matter. It is for that Office to say whether it will contribute.

Inquiry into Duties of Board of Trade and Local Government Board.

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer how many sittings Lord Jersey's Committee on the Pay and Duties of the Board of Trade, the Local Government Board, and other Departments have held during the last two months; when the Report of the Committee may be expected; and whether this House will be afforded an opportunity of discussing the Report of the Committee.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The Committee held their tenth meeting last Friday. I understand that they are now engaged in considering their Report.

Duty on Stripped Tobacco.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he will consider the advisability of withdrawing the 3d. tax on stripped tobacco and replacing it by an increased tax on imported cigars and cigarettes.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: No, Sir. I am unable to adopt this suggestion.

Inebriate Homes—Detention Regulations.

Mr. LLOYD MORGAN (Carmarthenshire, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the case of a prisoner who was committed by the magistrate at the North London Police Court to two years detention in an inebriate home; whether, without the consent of the magistrate, the prisoner was released from the home after being detained there for ten months, and was again arrested for drunkenness; and whether he will consider the question of prohibiting the release of any such offender before the expiration of the term of detention without first obtaining the consent of the magistrate who committed the prisoner.

The UNDER-SECRETARY of STATE for the HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. Cochrane, Ayrshire, N.) (for Mr. Akers-Douglas): The facts of the case are as stated in the Question. It is much to be regretted that this person, whose prospects seemed good, should have relapsed; but the decision as to the time when an inebriate may properly be released on licence rests with the managers of the reformatory who have him under their immediate supervision; and the case does not seem to afford sufficient ground for interfering with their discretion in this important matter or for making its exercise dependent on the concurrence of the committing magistrate, who could not be in an equally good position for judging the chances that release under careful conditions might be in the inebriate's best interests.

Unnecessary Licences—Refusals to Renew.

Mr. McKENNA: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he can give the number of licences, the renewal of which have been refused on the ground of being unnecessary, in each of the last two years, and the total assessment value in each year of such houses before and after the licences were refused.

Mr. COCHRANE (for Mr. Akers-Douglas): Taking the last two years for which Returns have been published, it appears that in 1900 justices refused to renew licences on the sole ground of their being not required in sixty-four cases, and in sixty-one other cases on that ground coupled with other grounds. In 1903 the figures were 220 and 201 respectively. I am afraid I have no means of answering the second part of the Question.

The Licensing Bill.

Mr. ASHTON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he will explain the meaning of the phrase, "value of licensed premises calculated as if this Act had not passed," in Clause 2, Sub-section 1, of the Licensing Bill; and will he state by whom and on what basis it is intended that the value of the difference shall be calculated.

Mr. COCHRANE (for Mr. Akers-Douglas): It is difficult, if not impossible, to compress into the form of Question and Answer a discussion of the meaning of isolated phrases in a Bill which is before the House and in an early stage. I venture to think that any explanation of the phrase quoted in the first paragraph of the Question that may be necessary may usefully be deferred till the Bill is under discussion in the House. As regards the second paragraph the sum to be calculated is the difference between the two values indicated in the clause, and the Commissioners of Inland Revenue will determine this on the ordinary principles of valuation.

Licensing Bill—Annual Value of Licensed Premises.

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, in view of the discussions upon the Licensing Bill, he will issue in a Parliamentary Paper the information as to the annual value of the licensed premises (included in the financial provisions of the Bill) upon which the Government has based the estimate given of the amount which will be produced by the annual levy under Clause 3 (1) of the Bill; and whether he will arrange for such information to be given for each county and county borough in England and Wales.

Mr. COCHRANE (for Mr. Akers-Douglas): As was stated in answer to my right hon. friend the Member for East Somerset a few days ago,† the Secretary of State for the Home Department will be ready to give hon. Members all the information in his power on this point, and he is considering the best form for the purpose.

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS: Will it be issued in the form of a Parliamentary Paper?

Mr. COCHRANE: My right hon. friend is considering the best form.

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS: And at an early date?

Mr. COCHRANE: Yes.

Administration of the Housing Acts.

Mr. CLAUDE HAY: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether, in accordance with The Housing Act, 1903, the administration of the Housing Acts has been concentrated in the Local Government Board, or whether the administration of those Acts is still divided between various Departments; and, in the latter alternative, what steps he has taken to give effect to the decisions of Parliament embodied in the said Act.

The PRESIDENT of the LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. Walter Long, Bristol, S.): A portion of the administration of the Housing of the Working Classes Acts in London is vested in the Secretary of State, and has not at present been transferred to the Local Government Board. The Act of 1903 does not require that such a transfer shall be made, although it affords a means by which it may be effected. I am quite willing that the transfer shall be made, and I have been in communication with my right hon. friend the Home Secretary on the subject. The matter is not yet settled.

Mr. CLAUDE HAY: How long will it be before we get the decision?

Mr. WALTER LONG: Very soon, I hope.

The Record Breaking Motor-Car Tour.

Mr. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if he is aware that a record breaking motor-car tour is now being undertaken from Land's End to John o' Groats; and if the police will be instructed to take care that the provisions of Clause 9 of the Motor-Car Act, 1903, are not infringed in England.

Mr. WALTER LONG: I understand that the tour referred to came to an end last week. In any case, however, I have no authority to give instructions to the police.

Motor-Cars in Hyde Park.

Mr. CATHCART WASON: I beg to ask the hon. Member for Chorley, as representing the First Commissioner of Works, if motor-cars are limited to a speed not exceeding ten miles an hour in Hyde Park, Constitution Hill, and the Mall; and, if so, have the police instructions to summon persons exceeding that speed.

Lord BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): The answer to the first part of the Question is in the negative. The police have instructions to summon persons driving in a dangerous manner or at an undue rate of speed, and the number of persons so summoned in 1903 was 108. Since 1st January last there has been only one summons.

Mr. CATHCART WASON: Is there no limit of speed imposed?

Lord BALCARRES was understood to say that the Parks did not come under the ordinary law in this respect, but it was provided by the regulations that the speed should be reasonable.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxxiii., 1033.

Ventilation of the Vote Office.

Mr. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the hon. Member for Chorley, as representing the First Commissioner of Works, if he will state whether any steps are being taken to provide ventilation for the Vote Office; and whether arrangements will be made to re-open the fireplace that a coal fire may be used, as formerly.

Lord BALCARRES: The Vote Office is now ventilated to the outer air. What appears to be required is a rectification of the high temperature which will be effected by the supply of a smaller radiator. It is quite impossible to restore the open fireplace, seeing that the smoke flue does not deliver to the outer air, but to the Commons lobby shaft. The fireplace was closed consequent upon smoke nuisance which could not be obviated.

Mr. WEIR: Why not use anthracite coal, which gives no smoke?

Welsh Education Grant.

Mr. ALFRED DAVIES (Carmarthen Boroughs): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Education if he will say how the approximate amount of £680,000 will be apportioned between the council and voluntary schools in Wales and Monmouthshire; and what will be the extra amount received in respect of both schools over that for the year ending 31st August, 1902.

The PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY to the BOARD of EDUCATION (Sir William Anson, Oxford University): The sum of £680,000 represents the total estimated amount of the Exchequer grants payable to local education authorities in Wales and Monmouthshire. The sum paid to each local education authority is not apportioned between council and voluntary schools, but constitutes a fund, which, supplemented as far as may be necessary by rates, enables the authority to discharge its obligation in respect of all public elementary schools within its area.

Carmarthen County Council Education Inquiry.

Mr. ALFRED DAVIES: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Education if he will explain why the Report of Mr. A. T. Laurence, K.C., on the Carmarthen County Council Education Inquiry, which has been in the hands of members of that council for some days, is not in the hands of Members of the House of Commons.

Sir WILLIAM ANSON: Copies of the Report which are in the hands of members of the Carmarthen County Council were sent them by the Board of Education in accordance with Section 73 of the Education Act, 1870. The copies which should now be in the hands of hon. Members will be those printed by command of the House; over this matter the Board of Education have no control. The copy was presented to Parliament on the same date that it was sent to the county council. I am informed that copies will be available at the Vote Office by this evening.

Lochcarron (Ross-shire) Water Supply.

Mr. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether the Local Government Board for Scotland are aware that the water supply for the village of Lochcarron, Ross-shire, is in a defective condition; and will such steps be taken as may be necessary to remedy the defect.

* The SECRETARY for SCOTLAND (Mr. A. Graham Murray, Buteshire): The Local Government Board have observed the reference in the recent annual report of the county sanitary inspector to the effect that the water supply for the village of Lochcarron, Ross-shire, is in a defective condition, and the matter will be dealt with in accordance with the Board's usual practice as soon as they have received the county medical officer's report.

Crossbost (Island of Lewis) Burial Ground.

Mr. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether he is aware that, although the burying ground of Crossbost, Island of Lewis, is certified as overcrowded the estate management have hitherto declined to arrange terms on which the Lochs Parish Council can acquire new ground; and will he cause some inquiry to be made into the matter with a view to the difficulty being overcome.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: I am informed that on the 5th of last month an arrangement was arrived at between the local authority and the estate in question for a new burying ground at Crossbost.

Destitution in Barvas (Island of Lewis).

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether the Congested Districts Board have received a resolution from the Barvas Parish Council, Island of Lewis, urging that, owing to the destitution prevailing throughout the parish in consequence of the general failure of crops last harvest and almost complete failure of the line fishing this spring, public works and footpaths should be immediately started throughout the parish; if so, will he say if the matter has yet been considered by the Board; and, if so, will he state their decision.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: The Congested Districts Board have received the resolution referred to and the matter has been considered by the Board. They are not prepared to start works to meet alleged exceptional distress, but they will favourably consider applications for any specific roads or paths which are shown to be of permanent value in the district and will make grants on the usual conditions as to local contributions and maintenance.

Motor-Car Regulations in Scotland.

MR. CATHCART WASON: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if he is aware that a record-breaking motor-car tour is now being undertaken from Land's End to John o' Groats; and if the police will be instructed to see that the provisions of Clause 9 of the Motor-Car Act, 1903, are not infringed in Scotland.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: I have received no official intimation of any such tour, but the newspaper reports which I have seen point to a record in the sense of the length of time without stopping the engine rather than any excessive speed. In any case the police have full instructions as to the Motor-Car Act and I have no reason to suppose they will fail to be guided by such instructions.

Inspection of Encumbered Estates.

MR. O'DOWD (Sligo, S.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether he can state the nature of the procedure to be adopted in the case of encumbered estates proposed to be sold to the Estates Commissioners under the Land Act of 1903; and will he explain whether the responsibility of inspecting such estates and ascertaining their true value rests with the Estates Commissioners or the Land Judge's Court.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): The procedure is prescribed by the 7th Section of the Act of 1903 and Rule 25 of the Provisional Rules issued by the Estates Commissioners in October last. It is the duty of the Commissioners to cause an inspection of the estate to be carried out, to make an offer, and to make an estimate of the price at which they propose to purchase, but it is for the Land Judge to accept the offer, subject to the provisions contained in the Act and Rules.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): And what will happen if the offer is not accepted?

MR. ATKINSON: The whole procedure is provided for in the statute.

Irish Local Government Act—New Order in Council.

MR. SHEEHY (Meath, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state when it is proposed to issue the new Order in Council, in compliance with the Local Government (Ireland) Amendment Act, 1902, and promised in the circular letter to the boards of guardians and district councils of 28th March, 1903.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): The Order is in preparation and will be issued before the next estimates are framed by local bodies.

Housing Question in Ireland.

MR. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Irish

Trades Congress, representative of 80,000 organised workers, called for legislation last year to deal with the housing of workers in towns and cities in Ireland; whether he has studied the petition on their behalf presented to this House; whether he is aware that a general feeling of satisfaction was created in Ireland by his promise to introduce a Bill this session to deal with the subject; and whether he will use his influence with the Government to secure the necessary time to carry out the promise so definitely made to introduce his Bill.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The reply to the first and second inquiries is in the affirmative. In respect of the others, I have nothing at present to add to my answer to the Question put to me on Monday last† by the hon. and learned Member for Waterford.

Mr. NANNETTI: When may we expect legislation on this question which has occupied the attention of His Majesty while in Ireland? Seeing that the King has made a speech expressing approval of these efforts when will effect be given to His Majesty's wishes?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order!

Bloomfield Estate, Pettigo.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Bloomfield Estate, near Pettigo, is in the Land Judge's Court; and, if so, how long has it been in that Court; is it solvent or insolvent; and whether it can be sold under the fortieth Section of the Act of 1896 or under the recent Land Purchase Act.

Mr. WYNDHAM: I have informed the hon. Member by letter that there is difficulty in identifying the particular estate in question, and that if he will be good enough to tell me the Christian name of the owner I will cause further inquiry to be made.

Achonry Estate, County Sligo.

Mr. O'DOWD: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether Captain Armstrong's Achonry Estate, in the county of Sligo, has recently been sold to the Congested Districts Board; and, if so, whether the sale includes the demesne and grazing ranches on the estate at present occupied by Mr. Phibbs, J.P.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The reply to both inquiries is in the affirmative.

The Rowe Estate.

Mr. FFRENCH (Wexford, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Rowe Estate has been in the Land Judge's Court over thirty years, and that the rental was settled twenty-five years ago, and that the solicitors having carriage did nothing about having a sale until the tenants applied a week ago; whether, seeing that the rental settled twenty-five years ago has had no effect, the Government will take steps to abolish this Court pursuant to the decision of this House; and when will a Bill be introduced for that purpose.

Mr. WYNDHAM: This Question was referred to the Land Judge's Court on Saturday, but so far I have not received a report on it. Perhaps the hon. Member will be good enough to repeat the Question to-morrow. The reply to the concluding portion is in the negative.

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL put a supplementary Question as to the advisability of appointing another Judge to assist the Land Judge.

[The answer was inaudible.]

Outdoor Relief in the Thurles Union.

Mr. KENDAL O'BRIEN (Tipperary, Mid.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the action of the Local Government Board for Ireland in refusing to sanction the allowance of outdoor relief by the Thurles Board of Guardians to the family of one Martin Delahunty, and to the fact that this family are absolutely destitute within the meaning of the Poor Law Relief (Ireland) Acts; and that by the action of the Local Government Board the wife and five children of Delahunty had to obtain admission to the workhouse, where their support and maintenance entails an expenditure out of the rates of about double the outdoor relief proposed to be granted by the local board of guardians; and, if so, will he ask the Local Government Board to reconsider their decision, or in the alternative recoup the guardians the extra cost entailed upon the ratepayers by reason of their action in this matter.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxxiii., 1055.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The Local Government Board did not refuse to sanction outdoor relief in the case referred to. The classes of persons to whom such relief can legally be given are mentioned in the first Section of the 10 Vic. cap. 31, and the Board merely reminded the guardians of the requirements of the statute.

Hugh Crofton's Estate, County Cavan—Stamped Receipts for Rent and Costs.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury what action, if any, does the Irish Inland Revenue Department propose to take with reference to the refusal of Robert H. Johnston, the agent of the estate of Hugh Crofton, in the county Cavan, to give to two tenants on that estate, Terence M'Govern, who paid £6 4s. ren due and costs of ejectment process, and Thomas M'Govern, who paid £3 15s. rent and costs of ejectment process, stamped receipts for the sums so paid when requested so to do; and whether there is any, and what, explanation of the failure of the Inland Revenue Department to take necessary steps to enforce the demand of the Messrs. M'Govern to Mr. Johnston for stamped receipts on the matter being brought under the notice of that Department.

The FINANCIAL SECRETARY of the TREASURY (Mr. Victor Cavendish, Derbyshire, W.): The matter is under investigation by the Solicitor of Inland Revenue in Dublin. There is at present no evidence of a refusal on Mr. Johnston's part to give stamped receipts for the payments in question, and until this can be proved there is no ground for proceedings under Section 103 of the Stamp Act, 1891.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: Will the Solicitor to the Inland Revenue communicate with these gentlemen?

Mr. VICTOR CAVENDISH: I have said that the matter is under investigation.

Arklow Harbour.

Mr. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): On behalf of the hon. Member for East Wicklow, I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the engineer appointed by the Irish Board of Works to examine the condition of Arklow Harbour has made in his Report any suggestions as to the means that should be adopted for removing the existing obstacles to navigation; if so, can he state those suggestions; and whether, in view of the present uselessness of the harbour and the consequent injury to the trade and prosperity of the town, he can say how soon the Board of Works will commence the operations necessary to give vessels free access to the port.

Mr. VICTOR CAVENDISH: Suggestions have been made by the engineer of the Board of Works as to the steps which might be taken for improving the condition of the harbour, which would apparently involve considerable expense. But the Board have no authority to undertake any works in the harbour. The Board of Works has done all in its power to free the entrance to the harbour by the loan of their dredger, thus enabling the fishing fleet to get in and out.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): I understand that the request is that the local people should be allowed to see the Report of the Board of Works engineer. Cannot it be supplied?

Mr. VICTOR CAVENDISH: I think there will be no difficulty in letting them have the Report.

Railway Tickets from Sligo to Cullooney.

Mr. O'DOWD: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether, in view of the fact that passengers travelling by the Great Southern and Western Railway from Sligo to Cullooney cannot book to the latter station, but must take tickets for Leyny, a station some miles further on, he will take steps to have this alleged grievance redressed.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): The line between Sligo and Collooney is the property of the Midland Great Western Railway Company. The Great Southern and Western Railway Company have, I understand, under an agreement entered into by the Waterford, Limerick, and Western Railway Company, prior to the amalgamation of the two companies, power to use the line for the purposes of through traffic to or from their line, but cannot carry local traffic. The matter does not appear to be one in which the Board of Trade have jurisdiction.

Baltimore Harbour.

MR. GILHOOLY (Cork County, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the condition of the beacon at the entrance to Baltimore Harbour; and whether he will request the Irish Lights Commissioners to remedy any defect in connection with it.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: My attention has not hitherto been called to the condition of the beacon in question. The Commissioners of Irish Lights inform me that it was whitewashed in 1900 and that arrangements have been made for whitewashing it again this year. If the hon. Member will place me in possession of any information he may have regarding alleged defects in the beacon I shall be happy to communicate it to the Commissioners.

Licensing Bills.

MR. LLOYD MORGAN: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in view of the debates on the Licensing Bill, he will give directions that the Intoxicating Liquors (Licensing) Bill, which was introduced on the 4th of April, 1871, be reprinted and circulated amongst Members as a Parliamentary Paper.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I am not aware of anything especially instructive in the Bill to which the hon. Gentleman refers to make it desirable to depart from the ordinary course and to reprint a Bill passed only thirty-five years ago.

Statue to the late Marquess of Salisbury.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH (Bristol, W.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether it is the intention of His Majesty's Government to propose a Vote for the erection of a statue of the late Marquess of Salisbury, in accordance with the action of Parliament in the case of other distinguished statesmen who have held the office of Prime Minister.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The House will readily understand that I have been unwilling to take the initiative in the matter referred to by my right hon. friend. But when a person of his standing and authority, who, I think, first served with Lord Salisbury in 1874, puts the Question to me, I can only say that in my judgment it would only be continuing the consecrated traditions of this House if this mark of respect to the memory of Lord Salisbury was paid. I believe that Lord Salisbury actually served a longer number of years as Prime Minister than any other statesman in this country since the great Reform Bill of 1832.

Scottish Congested Districts Bill.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he proposes to take the Congested Districts (Scotland) Bill before Whitsuntide.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I cannot make any arrangements with regard to this Bill at the present moment.

Alleged Boiling of Live Lobsters.

MR. CATHCART WASON: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Home Office a Question of which I have given private notice, viz., whether the attention of the authorities of the Home Office has been called to the practice of boiling and broiling lobsters alive in restaurants in this country.

MR. COCHRANE: The Home Secretary has made inquiries, and found that the lobsters are carefully killed before being cooked. The Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals has also investigated the subject, and has satisfied itself that the matter is not one for their intervention.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir H. CAMPBELL BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): May I ask the right hon. Gentleman as to the business of the House? There is one point in which hon. Members are specially interested, and that is what Bills the right hon. Gentleman will take to-night if the debate on the Scottish Education Bill should conclude before mid-night.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: If the debate concludes before twelve o'clock I shall endeavour to take some uncontroversial Bills. Perhaps my hon. friend the Member for the Wellington Division of Somerset will consult with the right hon. Gentleman opposite as to the Bills to be taken.

Sir HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.): I hope the right hon. Gentleman will exclude the India Councils Bill from the list of noncontentious Bills.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes.

Mr. BUCHANAN: What will be done after the Budget Resolutions to-morrow?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: While I hope the Budget Resolutions may not occupy the whole of the sitting to-morrow, I am obliged to consider the possibility of the reverse; and as the Government have not been allowed to enjoy the privileges of their predecessors in regard to the Report of the Resolutions in Ways and Means, I must ask the House to suspend the Twelve O'clock Rule. Wednesday will be devoted to the Bishoprics of Southwark and Birmingham Bill, and Thursday to Supply, but not the Irish Estimates. No great desire has been expressed for any special discussion on the Estimates on Thursday, and I will leave my hon. friend the Member for the Wellington Division of Somerset to arrange to suit the general convenience of hon. Members.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): Will the right hon. Gentleman consider the propriety of putting down the Cunard Agreement as second Order to-morrow? I cannot say it is uncontroversial, but the right hon. Gentleman has said it is desirable it should go through without delay.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I should have thought that the Cunard Agreement Committee was in no sense a Party matter or one against which a large number of Members desired to raise objection. If reasonable progress is made with the other business I shall place the Cunard Agreement as the second Order.

Mr. LOUGH (Islington, W.): Is there any precedent for suspending the Twelve O'clock Rule so early in the session?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: There are numerous precedents for the suspension of the Twelve O'clock Rule on the Budget Resolutions as well as on other matters.

PRIVATE LEGISLATION PBOCEDURE (WALES) BILL.

Ordered, That a Message be sent to the Lords to request that their Lordships will be pleased to give leave to the Lord Balfour of Burleigh to attend to be examined as a witness before the Select Committee on the Private Legislation Procedure (Wales) Bill.—(*Mr. Jeffreys.*)

NEW BILL.

MERCHANDISE MARKS BILL.

"To amend the sixteenth Section of the Merchandise Marks Act, 1887," presented by Sir Howard Vincent; supported by Mr. Samuel Roberts; to be read a second time upon Friday, 13th May, and to be printed. [Bill 172.]

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

[Second Reading.] Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

* **Mr. BLACK** (Banffshire) had the following Motion on the Paper, "That

this House declines to entertain a measure which proposes to commit the administration of primary education to areas consisting of counties or county council districts, in disregard of existing educational areas or such reasonable rearrangement of these as the special requirements of education in each case suggest." The hon. Member said that it would be a matter of congratulation with every true friend of education that this Bill did not, like the other Education Bills introduced by the Government, threaten in any sense to be the battle ground of contending sects. But what the debate thus lost in excitement it would largely gain in greater educational interest and usefulness. There was no Member of the House hailing from north of the Tweed, on whichever side he might sit, who was not convinced that education was not to be treated as the possession or privilege of the few, but it was the right of every boy or girl, however humble his or her origin, and however remote the place was in which he or she resided, to receive the education best calculated to fit him or her for the career of the greatest usefulness which his or her capacities rendered possible. This Bill was on its First Reading received with universal satisfaction, but that satisfaction must have partaken of the character of the satisfaction experienced by the boy who had expected corporal punishment and who had been let off with mere verbal condemnation. Judging from the nature of the Bills introduced by this Government relating to other parts of the United Kingdom, Scotch Members might have expected that a measure somewhat resembling the English Bill would be brought in. But in that they were pleasantly disappointed, and they found that the Government had, so far as the country north of the Tweed was concerned, agreeably changed their views upon various essential questions affecting the administration of education. There was general agreement on two essential questions. The first was that the education authority was to be *ad hoc*, and second that it was to be specially elected by the ratepayers for this particular purpose. But while these two very important elements of agreement were present in the Bill there were other matters not quite so satisfactory, and he hoped that when the Secretary for Scotland came to reply he would show a willingness to give heed to the friendly persuasion which no doubt would be addressed to him on the lines embodied in the Amendment which had been placed on the Paper.

The right hon. Gentleman in introducing the Bill congratulated himself on having to deal with a people willing to be educated. That was a perfectly true observation, but it was for consideration whether that willingness was due to the character of the people or whether it was not in some measure due to the character of the institutions under which they lived. An examination of great national movements in Scotland showed that they differed from similar movements south of the Tweed in that they proceeded direct from the people. Who knew what important effect that had upon national character, national institutions, and national efficiency? His contention was that it was desirable to exercise very great care not to ruthlessly destroy any essential element in rural Scottish life. His objection to the Bill was that it swept away the old administrative area in which Scotsmen had been accustomed to think, and asked them to transfer their thoughts,as far as education was concerned, to another area, which was not in itself the most suitable. Anyone who knew anything of Scottish rural life was aware that the county played but a small part in the lives and minds of the people. Amongst the most of them, the county town—except to those who lived in it—had no particular significance except as the place where punishment was undergone in certain conceivable events. All other matters affecting Scottish daily life were thought of in parishes. The ecclesiastical, educational, and Poor Law arrangements, etc., arose out of the parish; and before sweeping away such an essential feature of Scottish life it behoved them to consider very seriously whether the system proposed to be substituted for it was really a substantial improvement. He dared say that if one were compelled to admit that the only road to increased educational efficiency for Scotland were along the lines proposed by this Bill, one would be prepared to consider its provisions very carefully, and give them, at least, a favourable hearing. But he ventured to submit that before any great change was made in the Scotch educational arrangements the onus was very heavy on the promoters of the Bill to show that the change proposed was absolutely the best in the sense in which he had defined it—viz., that it would bring all parts of education to the poorest and most remotely situated children; and in the second place that there was no other way of attaining that object more consonant with the traditions and habits of the Scottish people.

He would recall to Members of the House who perhaps were not immediately connected with Scottish education, that the Bill proposed that for secondary and elementary education alike the area of administration should be the county council districts of each county, or the county itself where the county had not been divided into districts—thus sweeping away, as far as primary education was concerned, altogether the parish and the burgh as the unit on which the educational arrangements were to be conducted. He would ask whether the area proposed was the best possible for either primary or secondary education, because if it was not the most suitable for either it was quite impossible that it could be the best for both. In some cases it might be conceded that they were perfectly suitable for primary and others for secondary education; that in other cases they were not suitable for either; but it was found that in few cases were they suitable for both. An *ad hoc* authority should have an *ad hoc* area to administer. He found support for that proposition in the Resolutions passed by the Educational Institute—a body which practically embodied the whole of the teaching profession in Scotland—that the administrative area of each board should be determined solely on educational grounds. It was along that line that the Government should act.

He proposed to examine separately the qualifications of the area proposed in the Bill as applied to primary as contrasted with secondary education. The area for primary education should not be too large, either as regarded superficial area or population, to make it impossible for members of the board to know the education of the whole district, and be in direct touch with the parents and teachers. The Bill admitted that it was impossible for school boards as constituted to be in full touch with schools within their area, because it had been found necessary to introduce into the Bill very complicated provisions with regard to management of schools showing that it would be necessary for the board to delegate a large part of its functions. There was no provision more closely and justly criticised than that each board should be compelled to establish subordinate boards of management. It was perfectly apparent that, selected as they were, there would be room for endless friction in the working of the arrangement. The best men would not serve upon these boards of management because they would find themselves in a position of inferiority to those whose functions were to be delegated to them. He felt confident that when the Bill came to be discussed in Committee the provision dealing with the appointment of local managers would be rightly and successfully assailed as being unworkable. They would find that in many cases the areas would be exceedingly unmanageable. In some cases they extended over areas equivalent to three, sometimes over six, ordinary counties. If the matter of superficial area was laid aside, when they looked at the facilities of communication the question was even in a worse position. Thus, in many of these counties it would take days for members of the board to make the journey to attend its meetings. Then the members elected for one part of the area would have no knowledge whatever of the needs of other parts. What did a man on the coast know of the needs of the shepherd or agriculturist inland? The thing really spoke for itself. It was impossible for all the members of the board administering areas for primary education such as these proposed in the Bill to have that direct local knowledge which was a necessity for efficiency. In order that members might comprehend what these figures which he had quoted meant, let them think for a moment of the three Lothians, and compare them with the size of some of the proposed areas. What did North Berwick know about Broxburn, or Dalmeny about Whittinghame ?

Then the other element in considering the suitability of the divisions for primary education was that of population. Here one might find, perhaps, some basis of qualified agreement with the scheme of the Bill in regard to primary education. But that very element militated against its suitability when applied to secondary education. He had made an analysis of a Return recently issued of the population of the several areas proposed to be formed. Apart from the enumerated areas it was proposed to form 107 areas, of which seventy-seven had an average population of 12,000, and an average school population of 2,000. Thirty had an average population of 65,000, and an average school population of 10,000 or 11,000. Now, as applied to primary education, he was not disposed to quarrel with the idea that a school board was not overworked in supervising the education of 2,000 children, but in some cases, where the population was scattered, it was impossible for a board to supervise even that number. If they took the larger number of children in an area numbering 10,000 or 11,000 where the district was condensed, and the population was round one centre, even that was a suitable enough number, but where, as frequently happened, in the districts proposed by the Government, the population was scattered the objection as applied to superficial area was aggravated by the number of pupils which the school board would have to look after.

Examining further the proposals of the Bill as applied to secondary education, the fatal defect was that the areas proposed were chosen for purposes other than educational purposes. They were chosen for the administration of roads, drainage, and kindred subjects, and were not selected for education at all. For a suitable secondary educational area it was necessary that a district should run along the great lines of communication. In some cases the districts did run parallel to the lines of communication, and they might be suitable enough for secondary education areas where the population test was satisfactorily met. But where they did not run along the lines of communication, they were totally unsuitable. That suggested very strongly the need for an *ad hoc* area adjusted to the requirements of secondary education. When the population test as applied to secondary education was thoroughly examined, it would be found that the districts were still more unsatisfactory. Two thousand primary pupils would furnish too small a number of secondary pupils to make a really satisfactory secondary school. As he had pointed out, in seventy-seven areas the average number of school children was only 2,000, and he believed that the number of secondary education pupils was only about 3 per cent. of the number of primary pupils. But even if the proportion were 5 per cent., that would only give a school of from sixty to a hundred children in each secondary education area, and anyone who knew anything about secondary education was aware that that was a quite inadequate number to make a satisfactory school. Such a school could not afford to pay the teachers well enough, and the net result would be that the object of the Bill as regards suitable secondary education arrangements would be defeated in such cases. Those were abstract objections to the Government scheme; but when the proposals of the Bill were applied to the existing educational arrangements confusion became worse confounded. He had heard of one village which under the scheme of the Government would be cut into two; it had a school containing 160 children and the result would be that those children would be administered in two separate educational areas, and, as far as his information went, the rates in each would be different. Whenever under the County Council Act parishes were bisected, then separate rates were required for each part of the parish.

If all this were necessary it might be given a favourable hearing; but was it necessary ? Was there no other method that could be applied with greater effect and a better prospect of efficiency than that proposed in the Bill ? He ventured to assert that there was a much better method; and it was to be found in the reasonable growth of the present system of education rather than by a revolutionary cutting of it into two. Why not aggregate the existing parishes and boroughs into special primary education districts for the purposes of primary education, again aggregating the primary districts into larger districts for secondary education? There would be nothing impossible in that. They would have the advantage of aggregating the rating authorities, and in that way they would obtain a district specially adapted for the purposes of primary education, and a larger district specially adapted for secondary education. The only objection he had ever heard urged against it was that there might be some difficulty in getting the parishes to join in such a scheme; but he believed that with a suitable allocation of localities for educational purposes, parishes with low rates would be willing to make some sacrifice in order to have a thoroughly satisfactory district. Moreover, the objection was only transitory, and would disappear in six months. Whatever method the Government chose to adopt in aggregating the parishes would no doubt in certain cases excite some measure of comment; but it would only be transitory, and the result would be a perfectly symmetrical and satisfactory working scheme of secondary and primary education combined with the following advantages. First of all, there would be a reasonable growth of the present system; the new system would grow up out of and be co-ordinated with the existing system and would not break the century-old traditions of Scotland in the matter of education. In the second place, there would be a representative or representatives from each parish and borough who would be thoroughly acquainted with local needs, who would be in close touch with parents and teachers, and who would be the natural person or persons to undertake the duties of supervising the schools in the parish or borough. In the third place there would be an *ad hoc* area specially adapted to the needs of primary education. In the fourth place there would be secondary education districts properly adapted for that purpose, and having large districts they would be able to get rid of county prepossessions. As matters now stood, it was made a matter of necessity that secondary schools should be confined to a particular county; but with a large area and an *ad hoc* authority they would be able to disregard county boundaries altogether and have absolutely the most suitable and satisfactory area for secondary education. Further, there would be better secondary education schools, as universal experience had proved that small schools for secondary education purposes were not satisfactory. He knew of one large town in Scotland which had a secondary education school, and which was found to be so unsuitable that pupils passed it by and went to Edinburgh. That was not an uncommon experience, and was, after all, to be expected; because a good secondary school teacher was comparatively rare and required to be highly paid, and the school itself should be well diversified. If the school were small that would not be possible. In the fifth place, his proposal would get rid of the scheme of management provided by the Bill, because the representative of the parish or borough would be the natural manager of the school. Lastly, large secondary education areas could be readily affiliated with the Universities and work along with the Universities in promoting secondary, technical, and university education. On those grounds, he asked the Government to consider seriously the Motion he had put on the Paper. He had been given to understand that some hon. Members opposite were favourably disposed to its general idea, but that they found a difficulty in supporting it as it seemed to be hostile to the Government and the Bill. In those circumstances he did not propose to move it; and it would, therefore, be open to hon. Members without any hostility to the Government to express their views.

There were one or two other matters in connection with the Bill to which he desired to direct attention. As regarded the establishment of provincial councils, he found that they were not to be directly responsible to this House or to the ratepayers. It was quite true that half the members would be nominated by the school boards, but as regarded the other half they might be anybody or everybody, and the fundamental objection to that was that although they would not be responsible to anybody but themselves they would be exercising supervision and authority over popularly-elected bodies.

That would be a very undesirable innovation in a country which professed to be democratic. Further, there was the necessity of having the leading educational authorities with the head office of the Department in Edinburgh, so that members of the school board and others interested in education might have ready access to the persons responsible for the central administration. He had never been able to see the objection to that, and perhaps the Secretary for Scotland would state what the fundamental objection to it was. If it were merely to afford facilities to Members of this House, surely it was of greater consequenee that persons actually engaged in the work of education in Scotland should have an opportunity of being in touch with the Department. Indeed he had never been able to see why the Scottish Members should not form themselves into a Committee of Education with duly appointed officials and themselves see after this all-absorbing national question. An old historian described Scotland as a country with evil fruits, but producing good men. His right hon. friend the Member for Aberdeen would, no doubt, emphasise the goodness of the strawberries produced in his constituency, but, as a rule, the fruits were evil. One would, however, be glad to think that the other characteristic still remained. He was, however, afraid that things were not quite what they were in that respect, though Scotland did still produce men of efficiency and ability, as might be observed from the two Front Benches. In conclusion he would venture to ask the House to pause before interfering with a system which in the past had produced such excellent results in the production of men of intellect and culture eminent far beyond the limits of their own country.

*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. SCOTT DICKSON, Glasgow, Bridgton) said he confessed that he had not been able to gather from the hon. Member's observations much in support of the Amendment that stood in his name on the Paper. After the cordial and generous reception given to this Bill and the criticisms made upon it in the country he confessed that he was not prepared for an Amendment of this character, and still less was he prepared for it when he found on the Notice Paper an Amendment in the name of an hon. Member who was closely associated with those most experienced in educational matters in England, who desired to move, after a Second Reading of this Bill—

> "That it be an Instruction to the Committee on the Bill that they have power to extend the Bill to England and Wales, including London."

The Amendment of the hon. Member for Banffshire was in every sense ill-advised. In the first place it did not take account of what everyone who had studied the educational needs of the country insisted upon, namely, that primary education should not be divorced from higher intermediate secondary education, but that it should be brought more and more in co-ordination with it. This Amendment was entirely out of harmony with the facts, because it was not the case that the Bill they were now considering proceeded by constructing areas in disregard of existing areas. In the first place this Amendment would be fatal to a Bill which he ventured to think all Scotch Members and educationalists desired to see carried; in the second place it was founded upon wrong lines in this regard, that it severed primary from the other classes of education; and, in the third place, it proceeded under a total misconception of the facts.

He had no desire to say a word against the work the School Boards had done in the past in Scotland, because they had done good work, but the necessity for a change arose not from defects in the School Boards, but from essential changes in the circumstances of the country. The condition of things under which the present system was possible no longer existed in Scotland, because the University had set up a standard which made it impossible for many of the ordinary parish and burgh School Board schools to pass scholars to the University. He had no desire to speak ill of the parish schools of Scotland, because the greater part of his own education was derived first from the parish school and then from the burgh school. Thirty or forty years ago the Scotch University began education at a much lower age than they did now, and students went there at ten, twelve, and thirteen years of age. He went there when he was thirteen and there were those with him who were as young and even younger. That system had all passed away now, and a pupil, however able, could not pass direct from the parish school to the University, and accordingly they had to recognise that there was a need for some bridge connecting the rural parish school with the University. He recognised that in many large centres the School Board schools gave such an amount of education as readily enabled the more apt pupils to pass to the University, but they had to recognise the fact that in many districts that condition of things no longer existed, and they had to provide for the means of securing that all the stages of education and the various classes of education, primary, secondary, intermediate, higher class, higher grade, and continuation schools should be under one controlling authority, so that they could get one comprehensive system for the government of them all. The Amendment they were now considering seemed to him to enlarge the severance which existed now between primary education and the other classes of education which were now taught; and if for no other reason than that he ventured to think that the proposal which the hon. Member for Banffshire had submitted was one which nowadays would find no support amongst those who had given most study to education, and who understood the needs of education, especially in Scotch districts.

He took exception to the Amendment on this further ground, that it was not based on fact. The hon. Member spoke more than once of the suggestion that secondary education could be dealt with on different lines and under different control and management from primary education, and he thought no regard at all need be paid to what was at present the existing educational unit, namely, the parish. That was not so, and if the hon. Member had looked into the matter, he would have seen that these county districts which his right hon. friend had suggested as the unit in the Bill were not considered necessary. There might be exceptional cases, where one parish was partly in one county and partly in another, but apart from that, every county district under the Local Government Act of 1894 was merely an aggregation of parishes. At the very outset this was called a proposal which proceeded in disregard of the existing educational areas. The Bill paid further regard to the existing educational areas in this respect, for under Section 20 the management was given to those who were especially associated with the work of the parish. He agreed that this Bill, like other Bills and Acts dealing with this matter, did not proceed to specialise what was termed under-management, because it left that to the discretion of those primarily entrusted with the administration of the Act. The School Board would see that local interests and parochial desires were secured by making certain that those who were specially acquainted with the needs and the desires of the smaller administrative area, namely, the parish, and who took an interest in educational matters were made the managers of what would be the primary school for that smaller educational area and would secure what, after all, was the important factor, namely, the maintenance of local interest in educational affairs. In many other matters, in the payment of debt, in the rating authorities, and in the selection of managers, powers were granted, though, as his right hon. friend stated, that was not an essential feature of it. The proportion of the representatives of the local authorities was to be two-thirds nominated by the parish council and one-third by the larger area. Every effort would be made to secure the continuance of local interest and the progress of local education, and those powers would remain under this Bill, if it became an Act, just as as they existed under the former *régime.* The result therefore, he submitted, was that while on the one hand it might be true to say that for primary education the parochial limit was a very safe area to take, yet for secondary education he thought everybody would agree that a much larger area was necessary. If they considered the matter carefully, he agreed that there was room for discussion on the point, and there had been a great deal of discussion already as to whether the county or the county district should be accepted for the reasons adumbrated by his right hon. friend. He thought that it would be found that, after all, the county districts did not present conditions and qualifications which made it, on the whole, preferable to any other area that could be suggested.

The hon. Member for Banffshire, as he understood him, wanted two sets of administrative educational bodies; in the first place, he wanted an aggregation of existing parishes, that was two or three parishes for primary education, and then an aggregate of these units again for secondary education. He suggested that, after all, they had enough administrative areas for local affairs generally, and it would be a distinct advantage if they could take one of the existing administrative areas and make that the area for educational purposes. The House would observe that settling the area did not mean settling the authority, because he understood that there was practical unanimity on the point that they were to have an *ad hoc* authority for education. For reasons into which it was unnecessary to enter at length, the county district appeared to the Government to be the best area. The county district and the *ad hoc* authority would provide a body with a sufficiently large area to ensure that the interests of primary, intermediate, and secondary education would be so looked after as to secure a coherent, consistent, and comprehensive system all over the country. That would be advantageous to the pupils, who would find their educational requirements provided for on a reasonable system; and it was a method which met with the universal acceptance of the teaching profession—a point which, while not the most important, was undoubtedly a very important consideration in connection with any new educational arrangements. The teachers would have open to them a freer career, with more room for promotion than at present, and they would be free from those petty disturbances and tyrannies which were said occasionally to have occurred. The School Boards themselves, having larger areas, would have more authority and importance, and would be more easily able to hold their own against another form of tyranny—in which he had not much belief,—viz., that of the Department. Doubtless there were points in the Bill open to discussion, and possibly to amendment, but on the whole he submitted that the scheme should commend itself to all educationists and to the House generally.

There were one or two other points to which the hon. Member for Banffshire referred, but, so far as they were of any moment at all, they were matters for Committee. The Amendment of which the hon. Member had given notice was unwise in every article, it would prove fatal to the Bill, it was not based upon a true view of the educational requirements of Scotland or of the age, and it was really not founded upon fact, in that it proceeded upon the assumption that the Bill did not pay sufficient regard to the existing educational areas. He hoped the question would be treated not in any way as a Party question, but as one in regard to which all who desired to improve the educational conditions of Scotland could co-operate, in order that the Act best suited to the needs of the country might be produced. The Bill ought not to arouse Party recriminations, and it had been so framed as not to cause religious controversy. Therefore he hoped that, accepting the Bill in the spirit in which it had been proposed, the House would give a unanimous consent to the Second Reading, and then go on to consider in a spirit of mutual forbearance such points as required discussion in Committee so as to secure a measure which would advance the educational interests of Scotland.

Mr. THOMAS SHAW (Hawick Burghs), while congratulating the Lord Advocate on his speech, expressed his regret that the right hon. Gentleman had not said less about the Amendment and more about the Bill. After all, the hon. Member for Banffshire had not moved the Amendment; though, had he done so, it would have afforded not a little material for sound and useful discussion. In his opinion the whole scheme of the Bill might have been adjusted in the most friendly manner without the House being bound beforehand to any particular scheme of geographical districts. His first impression of the Bill had not been rendered less favourable by a perusal of the measure, but he felt that he would not be discharging his duty if, on the Second Reading, he did not take the whole question into consideration, and offer one or two suggestions with regard to details which came more fully into view on seeing the Bill in print. Much satisfaction was afforded by the fact that School Boards were going to be continued; but whether or not that satisfaction would carry them too far in approving the whole Bill he could not say. They were in the position of people whose house had been in danger from an incendiary who had been at work in the immediate neighbourhood, causing great disturbance and havoc, but whose torch had practically gone out before he reached their district. But while a very revolutionary attitude was not adopted towards School Boards as such, there was a wholesale destruction of the existing School Boards, and a reconstruction and supersession of the old areas by other allotted areas. Upon that and other points discussion in Committee would doubtless be helpful.

What was the situation in Scotland where a system of universal School Boards had been in existence for thirty-two years? What had that system accomplished, and what was the secret of its success? Many people, of whom he was one, thought that Scotland was still far from perfect, but when taking leave of the old system it was well to consider what they had derived from it. The secret of its succes was twofold. In the first place there was a close and intimate reliance on the people themselves. The splendid manner in which that trust had been vindicated afforded one of the finest possible defences of the practical application of the theoretical principle of trusting the people and of representative government. In the second place, there had been liberty to give far more than primary education, and the School Boards had been allowed to tax the people for much that in those days might have been held to be the height of revolutionary fervour in the direction of secondary education. Technical education also had been managed by the School Boards. The words of Lord Young, the author of the Act of 1872, in this connection, were worthy of note. Speaking at a meeting at Aberdeen in 1877 Lord Young said—

> "The policy of the Act is that the public schools of each school district should be maintained and managed by the people of the district who are immediately interested in their welfare. I will never, I believe, admit that the people of a Scotch parish or burgh, are incompetent to choose a board of managers, who may be safely and advantageously entrusted with the management of their own schools, or that the managers of their choice require to be put under the supervision and control of any central authority."

—which meant a liberty to the School Board to deal not only with the measure and standard of education but with the thorny subject of religion also. The Lord Advocate had said—

> "Now the key-note of this national education is liberty—liberty to the people of each school district to determine, not once for all but from time to time according to the changing circumstances and ripening experience and presumably advancing intelligence, what subjects shall be taught in the schools thereof. This liberty, which extends to religious as well as secular instruction, is necessarily, with a view to the practical exercise of it, delegated by those who possess it to a limited number in whom they have confidence. But the responsibility of the delegates is direct and immediate, and I think that I do not overestimate the intelligence of the people in any district of Scotland, be it Highland or Lowland, rural or burghal, when I say that, however illiterate many of them may be individually, they will find out somehow, and know for certain, whether the schools which they pay for and to which they send their children are good or bad; whether or not they are reasonably well conducted, and fairly serve their purpose."

That was a most admirable statement, and a complete doctrine of the liberty of the teacher. Since 1872 under the system of a universal School Board the teachers of Scotland had complete liberty to deal with religion or not as they liked. In 1872 the population of Scotland was 3,395,000. In 1903 it had increased to 4,571,000 or 34 per cent. Teachers had not been as a body very favourable to Lord Young's scheme of 1872. How had they fared? Their salaries had increased 45 per cent, and the numbers of certificated teachers had increased from 2,566 in 1872 to no less than 12,195 in 1903—an increase of 371 per cent; school accommodation had increased 237 per cent and was now complete, while the school attendance had increased by 213 per cent.

There could be no feeling but that of gratitude to the Government for having introduced this measure. There was an old Scottish proverb that a Scotchman liked to see both sides of a shilling, and the truth of that proverb had been proved years ago. But what had Scotland done in this matter? Last year she had paid for her schools 11½d. in the £ on the entire rentals of Scotland, and, however parsimonious they might be in some aspects of life, no one could say with regard to education that Scotland was a country of parsimony. Although he did not entirely agree with the Bill there was a good deal in it that attracted him and he would not quarrel with it. But he would have given power to the School Boards to combine with the parish councils of Scotland, which had taken the place of the old parochial bodies and have drawn no hard and fast line. The authority of this Bill was to proceed from the greater to the less—from the district councils who were to be responsible to the local managers—and if the same result could be obtained by proceeding from the greater to the less as from the less to the greater he would throw no obstacle in the way. But there were one or two great dangers in the Bill. First of all he feared that the districts were too large. He reminded the right hon. Gentleman that some towns had not been taken into consideration, and that some of the urban counties aggregated a million votes. The next thing he had to say with regard to the districts was that they were originally formed not for educational purposes but for road administration. He did not see any relation between the two subjects at all. If children travelled by road it would be different, but in nearly all the districts there was railway communication, and it was for that reason, he thought, that in many cases trouble would arise. He would give an instance from his own constituency. He had received an admirably and moderately worded letter from the School Board of Galashiels. The situation was this. Galashiels was at the junction of several counties; in fact, if he remembered aright, the division of the counties ran actually through the burghal area. The letter contained the following—

> "Galashiels, situated on the main line of railway and an important seat of the tweed trade, is naturally and geographically an educational centre. The School Board here have done more than any other in the Border to promote higher and technical education. They have the best secondary school, the most flourishing continuation classes, their technical school is a long way ahead of any other in the Border. In his report to the Education Department, Professor Beaumont made the following observations upon our school and the Glasgow Weaving College: 'These two institutes are serving the educational interests of the tweed, fancy cotton, and other branches of the weaving industries of the South of Scotland. There are other local classes held at Hawick and Selkirk, but Glasgow and Galashiels are the most important schools, being equipped with looms and other apparatus for experimental as well as theoretical treatment of the subjects of textile designs and manufacture.'"

Pupils came to the weaving school at Galashiels from Stow in Midlothian, and Melrose and St. Boswells in Roxburghshire. There were also pupils belonging to Galashiels, which itself was in two counties. He was not stating this instance in any sense in an unfriendly way to the Bill, but in order to show that these districts would require a good deal of adjustment. It was out of the question to say a road district would fit a case like that. They should rather start with a centre, and aggregate to it all the districts which supplied pupils to it, and make that a working *ad hoc* district according to the theory of his hon. friend who opened the discussion. He mentioned these facts to the House to show that the Bill would require a good deal of knocking about and adjustment in order to make it fit the exact educational situation in many parts of Scotland. What was wanted in Scotland, and what he thought hon. Members on both sides of the House were desirous of having was—to put it in a word—that the highest secondary and technical education should be brought within the reach of everyone who was capable to receive it. The suggestion had been made that burghs with 10,000 inhabitants should be left with their own School Boards, as well as selected districts, with the power of aggregation of the neighbourhood to them, making the larger towns the centres. That might be one way of doing it. Another way of doing it in loyalty to this Bill was so to carve this measure as to enable a boundary commission, or otherwise, to suit the educational wants of the districts and have the whole country covered in that way. His anxiety was that nobody should be missed out, and to give throughout Scotland an opportunity to every capable son and daughter of his country of getting the best he or she could out of the educational appliances of the State.

He was gratified that the *ad hoc* principle had been preserved, but he might point out that while the Bill conceded the necessity for local management, they parted with that principle in the remoter districts in regard to the appointment of local managers. There were to be two-thirds from the parish councils. That was a thing that might require some explanation. When they got back to the old School Board area they had departed from the *ad hoc* principle, and disfranchised from the management of education capable men in the district. He desired that the defect should be remedied at least in one way, and that was that they must make provision for the expenses of the members of the School Boards in the remote localities. If they had that, they would get the clever poor man to sit on these Boards. In some places in the North of Scotland it was impossible to get the country properly educated unless they had the clever man in humble circumstances who knew the wants of the district. Unless they provided facilities for that man sitting on the district board, they might as well write out representative control in a large proportion of the provinces.

He must now be quite frank to the House on the religious question. He profoundly regretted that the educational work of Scotland was apparently going to be disturbed by some portions of this Bill. They had had absolute peace in Scotland. What they had done was this. They had on the School Board Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Roman Catholics, Quakers, and Jews, if there were any in the North, all doing their best for the schools under representative control. The voluntary schools, as he would show, had done very well alongside of that general system. Under the general system between seven-eighths and eight-ninths of the school population of Scotland had been educated, and he thought, upon the whole, educated very well. There were some parts of Scotland where there was a large proportion of Roman Catholic population alongside the Protestant population. What they did, in the Island of Barra for instance, was this, roughly speaking. The one half were Catholic, and the other half Protestant. They erected a Board school. There were so many Catholics and so many Protestants on the School Board; they met together in friendly conclave, and administered the rates of the entire district. The headmaster was a Catholic, and the assistant master a Protestant. In the morning, at different ends of the school, the Catholic and Protestant teachers, respectively, give religious instruction for twenty minutes or half an hour, and after that they did the work of secular education. That had been going on for a decade, and nobody was the worse. Education had been thriving all the time. That was an example of what happened under representative control. If they chose to trust the people in this matter of religious instruction there would be no trouble at all. Apart from Acts of Parliament altogether, his own view would have been to leave religious instruction to the parents and churches. It was not good for religion, and it was very productive of soreness in all civil relations that the State should have been brought in. His view in the abstract would have been to leave the matter alone. But it had not been left alone.

The voluntary schools had thriven very well in Scotland. In 1872 there were forty-six Episcopal, and twenty-two Roman Catholic schools. Under the system of grants—he did not say they were too lavish at all—which had left them separated from the national system, though they were doing national work, the numbers now were sixty-six Episcopal, and 192 Roman Catholic schools. In the case of these schools the amount paid in grants was £43,000 a year, so that on the whole the voluntary system had not been starved out during that period. He, therefore, would have preferred to leave the whole system alone. He quite recognised that if the Bill was to deal with that question it might have dealt with it by paying some specific tribute to the principle of popular representative control. Not only had the schools a grant, but the voluntary schools had a preferential grant in Scotland of 3s. per head. What this Bill proposed to do was to give power—he hoped this provision would not be passed—to rope in all the rates of the districts and to grant—

> "Pecuniary aid upon such conditions as they may from time to time prescribe to

schools and institutions not under their charge, where such schools or institutions are recognised by the Department as supplying efficient education."

That was the provision of Sub-section 3 of Section 31. He regretted to say that already that was causing very considerable disturbance in Scotland. He hoped that Parliament would lay down that if these voluntary schools were, as he said, to be roped in under the ordinary system they would be under the ordinary system of national control. If that were done, they could pass the clause in five minutes. But if they left that out what would happen? In every parish or burgh in Scotland where there was a voluntary school there would at once be an agitation to put it on the rates and there would be harassing grumbling in all these places between Catholics, Episcopalians ,and Protestants. What he insisted upon was that if any voluntary school was going under the State system it should be under representative control. But the position which the Roman Catholics and Episcopalians would probably maintain was that they were entitled to be put on the rates without any control whatever, and the moment a dispute occurred they would have the old trouble renewed in parish and town wherever there were voluntary schools. This religious difficulty should have been left alone, or submitted to popular control. His opinion was that if the voluntary schools were to be put on the rates that should only be granted on two conditions. First, that the existing preferential capitation grant of 3*s*. should be abolished; and, second, that private management and control should be largely removed, because if they were to go on the national system they ought to go on the national conditions. He believed he was speaking for three-fourths of the people of Scotland when he said that there was no wish to introduce religious feeling as was now proposed to be done. He was sorry that the idea had ever been mentioned that in our civil relations or in the performance of our civil duties we should be ruled or governed in any respect by questions of religion or creed. But it would be introduced now unless Parliament took up a clear, emphatic, and perfectly logical attitude in regard to it. No man had a higher regard than he had for the Scotch Education Department; but really this Bill carried things too far. If we were to have bureaucratism at all in this matter of education, he would like a better form of it. The bureaucracy of Dover House had been a stifling influence on local initiative.

There were some extraordinary provisions in the Bill in regard to which he would trouble the House with a few remarks. Section 39 dealt with the administration of a large sum of money—many hundreds of thousands of pounds in amount —and with the distribution of that amount amongst various schools. It was known as "The Education (Scotland) Fund." And Section 40 said—

> "The power of determining what schools or institutions, not being such day schools as are on the list of schools conditionally entitled to share in the annual Parliamentary grant for education as aforesaid, shall be admitted to, or excluded from, the benefits of the immediately preceding section of this Act shall rest with the Department."

That was to say, that there was to be a whole set of bodies engaged in raising funds for the maintenance of the schools, and district boards to supervise the educational apparatus and machinery; but that above all these there was to be this Education Department, sitting in London, which would settle for itself and for Scotland, and irrespective of all local opinion, what were to be the schools and institutions that were to get the benefits of this annual Parliamentary grant.

*The SECRETARY for SCOTLAND (Mr. A. Graham Murray, Buteshire) said that the power of determining what schools or institutions, other than day schools, as were on the list of schools conditionally entitled to share in the annual Parliamentary grant, should rest with the Department.

Mr. THOMAS SHAW: But who was to be judge of that? It was the Department alone. Was the Department not to take any local advice; not to consult the local district boards, or the local managers? Was all this to be done with Scotch money, administered in London by a Department which did not know the local conditions of either the schools or of the local bodies? The danger was that this central Department, sitting in London, would get into some sort of antagonism with local educational opinion. Then, what was to be the condition of the groups of education districts under the very wonderful provincial councils for education which were to be set up under the 43rd Section? They were to have no legislative power, no money. They were to be a source of expense by having clerks and officers; and they were to be representative in respect of one-half of their members, and not representative in respect of the other half. A fourth of each provincial council was to consist of persons elected by the *Senatus Academicus* of one or more of the four Scottish Universities; but what return were the Universities going to give for this representation? Another fourth was to be gathered from representatives of superior educational institutions other than Universities throughout Scotland. And the provincial councils were to assist the Department in regard to the adequacy or inadequacy of the provision made for the higher education of the population within any education district. But if the Department and the provincial councils agreed on any subject contrary to the opinion of the locality, farewell to the control of the local authorities. And what would happen if the provincial councils did not agree with each other, or with the Department? The whole thing seemed to him a constriction of the ventilation of ideas. If he thought these provincial councils were to have effective power, he would denounce them as most harmful. It was only because he did not think they would have any power either for harm or good that he did not take a strong line against their constitution. Whether there were four councils or one was all the same to him; all he wanted was representative control from top to bottom.

He regretted that there was any reference in the Bill to the subject of fees. He saw that the School Board might charge a higher scale of fees for pupils resident outside the district of the School Board than for pupils resident within it. He hoped to see the day when any such reference to fees would be regarded as out-of-date. He did not see why any fees should be charged for technical or secondary education in Scotland. There were no fees charged for primary education; and now provision had been made whereby fees were substantially abolished in the Universities. Why should there be, in regard to technical and secondary education, a species of middle punishment? If fees were to be charged by School Boards for primary education, he objected entirely to such a system of classifying the pupils. If pupils came into the national system they should come in as the children of the State, entitled to inheritance of the State, and no distinction or class level should be applied to them. The whole scheme of education should be made free from top to bottom; and that was the only system by which alone we could compete in technical and secondary education with Germany and the United States. As the House was aware, there were no technical or secondary schools, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, to which American children could not go and where no fees were paid. The only question was whether the charge should be a Federal or a State charge. In Germany, if a technical or secondary school was attended, the pupils escaped two years compulsory military service; and the result was that in the United States technical and secondary education was free, and in Germany it was almost more than free. Now, in a time when we had such severe competition in business and commerce from these quarters in all parts of the world; when it was our interest to have our workmen, foremen, and leaders of industry well trained in technical and secondary subjects, he thought it was very regrettable that they, in Scotland, could not take the plunge for free education all round.

He was very anxious that the House should take stock of the situation. He hoped that in the friendly discussions on this Bill, nothing he had said would be taken amiss. His desire was to broaden the Bill and make it applicable to every part of Scotland. They were living in a time of swift progress for education in Scotland. His hope was that they would be able to put Scotland in the very front rank of the nations of the world in regard to technical and secondary education. There was plenty of money available in the circumstances. When they thought of the money available and spent like water for other purposes, they should be proud to give what was comparatively a drop in the bucket for the promotion of the highest and best education of their youth. No doubt there was a rivalry in regard to education among the nations; but it was the best kind of rivalry. They would gain far more national prestige by improving to the highest pitch the education of their people in technical and secondary subjects. In that way they would occupy a loftier and worthier place among the nations of the world by this comparatively limited expenditure than from military vain-glory and costly expenditure on the instruments for the destruction of human life.

*MR. PARKER SMITH (Lanarkshire, Partick) said that every one who had listened to the speech of his hon. and learned friend must have realised that it was inspired by a thorough desire to make the best of the Bill before the House. He did not agree with his hon. and learned friend on all his points; but these could be discussed in Committee. He did not agree in the gloomy prognostications of the hon. and learned Gentleman in regard to the clause enabling the School Boards to make arrangements with the voluntary schools. He did not think that, under the Bill, the religious difficulty would arise. He doubted whether arrangements could be made with the managers of the Roman Catholic schools by which public control of these schools could be secured. But if they were to strengthen the local Boards in every way they must give them responsibility. The hon. and learned Gentleman was hardly consistent in his argument, because, after objecting to the School Boards having this responsibility over the voluntary schools, he also objected to give power to the Department. One or other must take the responsibility. They were happily free in this discussion from the religious difficulty altogether; and they were able to look at the matter from an educational point of view, and with the sole desire to secure for Scotland all they could in the way of improvement of education. Everyone felt that this Bill was a genuine and honest endeavour to develop education. In Scotland when it was introduced it was received with a strong and unanimous chorus of congratulation; and if since then some criticism had emerged no hostile attack had been made on the measure. It would pass its Second Reading unopposed; and he hoped that in Committee they would have a discussion not marked by ordinary Party divisions but by a desire to take the best line possible from an educational point of view. He was sorry it was not proposed to send the Bill to a Committee such as the Scottish Licensing Bill went through last year. There they had a full representation of Scottish Members interested in licensing, and they were able to discuss the measure with a great deal more freedom than would have been possible on the floor of the House. He would like to see an arrangement of that kind adopted for discussing this Bill also.

He wished to look beyond the question which had been mainly discussed during the afternoon with reference to the division of the country into areas. This was an Education Bill and they ought to consider the great problem set before them from an educational point of view. What were the questions which they ought to have satisfactorily solved if they were to give good education to the people of Scotland? In the first place, they would want to know who were to be the teachers and what were to be their training and qualifications They should see that the teaching profession was made such that it would attract good material, and that the training given was sufficient to make the best of that material. Then they would want to know what would be done with the children during the long years that the State kept them at school. These were questions to which the greatest skill and attention the country could give should be applied. A long way after those matters came the questions of the organisation of the channels through which the funds of the State came to the schools; how the country was to provide it; and what the system of management was to be. Those were necessary, but subordinate, questions, the chief question being with regard to the teachers, which was all-important. In that connection he thought it was a great blot on the Bill that no attempt was made to deal with the question. It was a simple waste of money to pour it out upon schools and classes for special subjects and yet not have a man to take charge of them who not merely knew something of the subject, but who was soaked in the knowledge of it and was able to give children that interest in it, which could only be obtained by contact with a man completely cognisant of it. Much had been recently done both by the Department and by the Universities to improve the training of teachers; but a great deal still remained to be accomplished. The training colleges were not satisfactory; nominally they were denominational, in fact they were not; and they were practically financed by the State. Of the whole amount of their income last year, namely, £60,000, only £3,000 came from sources other than the State, and the voluntary subscriptions only amounted to £150. He should like to know whether any money could be spent upon training colleges and the training of teachers under the provisions of the Bill. It was not explicitly stated, but it seemed to him it ought to be in the very forefront of the measure, as being the principal object on which funds devoted to education should be expended. There were matters which ought to be under local control; but the training of teachers was one which he did not think that even the greatest of the School Boards desired to undertake, and which certainly would be better undertaken by the country at large. He hoped it would be one of the most prominent objects for the employment of the Education Fund. That was necessary, not only with regard to teachers of general subjects, but even more particularly with regard to teachers of technical and industrial subjects. The training and adequate supply of fully competent teachers was undoubtedly one of the greatest needs of the day. There was no doubt that the position of teachers would be very greatly improved under the system of larger areas proposed by the Bill. Their work would be known and they would have a better chance of promotion. He felt, however, that it was much more important to spend money in seeing that the teaching profession was developed to its utmost extent than in putting a smattering of ill-digested knowledge into the heads of children who soon forgot it.

Then there was the question as to what the children were to be taught. They were now kept at school up to the age of fourteen; but how were they to be occupied? It was not enough to train their intellects only; they should train them morally from the religious point of view, and, as regarded that, happily there was no difficulty to speak of in Scotland. There was, however, another side which was developing itself more and more, and on which all recent inquiries had laid great stress. It was not enough to put undigested fragments of knowledge into their minds. Physical training was essential if future generations were to be strong, healthy, good, and useful citizens. The new education authorities would have to consider that question. In its most extreme form it was a demand for food. In some cases he thought that was necessary. Where, for instance, cripples were brought to school in the morning and kept at school all day, undoubtedly it would be necessary to feed them; but where there was a general demand for food, although it might eventually have to be met, they ought to try first every other method which would be a less dangerous expedient. The teacher should be scientifically trained so that they could see whether children were fit and healthy, whether they were able to benefit by the teaching that was given them, or whether they were suffering from any physical evil which ought and could be removed. For in-instance, a teacher should know if a child was suffering from deafness which might be cured or whether a child was short-sighted, in which case there ought to be provision for giving such a child glasses. Again, the condition of the children's teeth ought to be watched. The teacher ought to know whether they were able to chew their food properly, or whether they were laying up weaknesses and illnesses for themselves by having a useless set of teeth. Investigations recently made on the subject showed that a great percentage of children were suffering from bad teeth, and that their digestion and whole physical and mental powers suffered in consequence. A short time ago he wrote a letter on the subject to the papers and received a large number of replies giving the opinion of teachers. Only that morning he received a letter from a lady teacher in Scotland, who obviously went through a course of dentistry, stating that she extracted in one afternoon twenty-three teeth from pupils in her school and that they all appeared to be the better for it. There was no risk of pauperising people by extracting their teeth gratuitously. Hitherto there had been boundless and ungrudging expenditure on education in Scotland, but there were now signs of inquiry as to whether value was being obtained for all the money that was paid away in this way. That would come to a head unless more attention was given to the selection of subjects taught to the children. For nine-tenths of the children literary subjects were not the most suitable. They had to look for subjects both suitable for the development of character and such as would give opportunity for training the intelligence of the children and also which would be useful to them in after life. One of the subjects which best fulfilled these conditions was cooking. That should be taught to every girl, if not to every boy, in their last school years. It was being taught with the best results in many cases. If a proper knowledge of and interest in cooking could be implanted in the minds of the girls and women of Scotland, the results to the country would be overwhelming. In economy, in health, in temperance, the social reform would be incalculable. They had heard much about free food lately, but what was the use of free food if it were cooked so badly that it had to be thrown away, or if the people had no teeth fit to deal with it when it was set before them?

With regard to organisation he desired to see the School Board strong, with local initiative and freedom. He wanted to see the School Boards have responsibility put upon them and form their own opinions. Two points which had met with universal approval were the increasing of the area of the education district and the *ad hoc* bodies. Districts were much better than parishes, but he thought it would be found when they came to discuss the Bill in detail it would be better to have counties than districts. There ought, he thought, to be power to divide a county when it was too big, but they might start with a county and cut it up if it was too big. They might find it difficult to lay down hard and fast lines, and perhaps the best solution would be the establishment of a Commission to inquire and to make divisions accordingly. On this question of a division he desired to say a few words with regard to a particular locality —the parish of Govan. That, at the present time, had the third largest School Board in Scotland. The population of the School Board district was over 200,000, and in that district he found a strong objection to the amalgamation with Glasgow which was proposed. It seemed to him that unless a much stronger case of educational and administrative advantage could be made out, the presumption was in favour of letting things alone. He did not in the least believe that the Lord Advocate or anyone else would seek to justify the proposal for amalgamation on any slackness of the School Board of Govan, which was one of the most effective School Boards in Scotland. The two boards were working perfectly harmoniously, the one anxious to continue and the other not wishing to force their friends into amalgamation against their will. He should urge very strongly that the School Board and parish of Govan should be left standing as they were. Having regard to the feeling he had referred to he hoped the Government would consider favourably the proposal to leave Govan as another enumerated area.

Provincial Councils were an excellent plan to bring together the representatives of the Universities and the educational bodies, but satisfaction would not be obtained by four such bodies. There should be a single body covering the whole of Scotland, and Codes and circulars of the Department should come before that council for criticism before they were laid upon the Table of the House of Commons. Another point on which strong opposition would arise was with regard to the grants that were to be taken from the local authorities and handed over to the control of the Department. On the strength of those funds, the counties had incurred liabilities, and it was impossible that they should be taken away without due warning. The grant of 1892 was not given for education. Out of £100,000 not more than £500 was spent upon education. For his own part he disapproved of their being taken away at all, and a great deal would probably be heard of the proposal before the Bill passed. The local authorities would not grudge money for higher education, but it was far better that they should be allowed to allocate the funds as they thought best, than that the money should be taken away and placed under the control of the Department. He intended cordially to support the Bill, but he hoped that in Committee the points to which he had referred would be treated as open questions so that they might be discussed fully and frankly with the single view of doing what was best for the education of Scotland.

*MR. CHARLES DOUGLAS (Lanarkshire, N.W.) believed the Bill to be an honest attempt to deal with a situation which urgently called for attention. National optimism had led the people of Scotland to be too long satisfied with the existing condition of affairs. In the years immediately following the creation of School Boards there was a great increase of educational interest throughout the country, and the work of the School Boards was essentially the active work of developing that interest and creating the fabric of education under the guidance and with the support of the Scotch Education Department. In recent years, however, that state of matters had altered for the worse. During the last fifteen years the position of the School Boards had been much more passive; they had exercised a much smaller degree of initiative; and in all matters of importance and in many of detail they had been practically deposed by the Department governing from London. Out of this condition of affairs, two great defects had developed themselves—first, a loss of local initiative, with the consequent loss of local interest; and, secondly, a lack of close co-ordination between the local systems under which primary and secondary education were administered. For his own part, he plainly declared his belief that this Bill was an honest, vigorous, and he hoped it would be a successful, attempt to deal with that state of affairs. It was generally admitted that, for the proper co-ordination of primary and secondary education, a great extension of local administrative areas was necessary. On that point he was glad the hon. Member for Banffshire had not moved his Amendment, because otherwise many Members would have been placed in the difficult position of having to choose between affirming a proposition which was theoretically indisputable and attempting to select the best from among the existing areas, every one of which was doubtless open to objection. The task of creating fresh areas solely for the local administration of education would have broken down any Education Bill, and the Government had acted wisely in selecting the local government areas. It ought not to be beyond the skill of the Secretary for Scotland and his advisers, with the assistance of the Committee, to obviate some of the difficulties which would be brought out in discussion, without in any way departing from the principle they had adopted.

Another question for consideration was that of the voluntary schools. That was not a very large problem in Scotland, but in certain respects it was a very acute one. There were communities of poor Catholic parents, mainly Irish, who not only contributed from their slender resources to the rates for the maintenance of schools in which denominational theology was taught, but also chose to have their children educated in separate Catholic schools which they had to support out of their own pockets without assistance from the rates. That was not an altogether justifiable state of affairs, and he would be greatly surprised if it produced a state of pure and idyllic content. He entirely agreed that it would be much better that the State should have nothing whatever to do with the teaching of religion. The State had no right to impose the tests which were really necessary if religious education was to be anything more than a name.

That solution of the difficulty, however, was not practicable, and in Scotland they were debarred also from the "Cowper-Temple" solution of an uncontroversial form of religious belief, because the view held by his fellow-countrymen as a whole would be that no theological proposition was uncontroversial unless it was supremely unimportant. Under these circumstances, denominational teaching was necessary, and that policy should be tempered with the utmost generosity towards any large minority of parents who wished separate provision to be made for their children. It would be a deplorable result if that necessity should lead to the introduction of religious controversy into the School Board elections. Personally, he did not anticipate such a result, because he believed the people in the districts chiefly affected would be sincerely disposed to do justice all round. It was difficult to see how the matter could be dealt with otherwise than as proposed, as the Department would find it an impossible task to deal separately with all the schools and decide in each particular case whether or not the school should have assistance from the rates. It was essentially a matter of local fact and circumstance, to be dealt with as each individual case demanded, and as such it was one of the subjects most proper to be committed to a School Board to which other large and important duties were to be entrusted.

The central difficulty of the Bill would probably be found in the method by which it proposed to deal with educational finance. With regard to Part III. of this Bill, the policy might be summed up by saying that they would have to pool every shilling which they could get for education and hand it over to the Department. The sum they were dealing with was over £540,000, but the greater part of that money was now controlled by the local authorities. There was £440,000 of that total which was not under the control of the Department at all. Therefore, this Bill in regard to its proposal upon this point represented a very great increase in the power given to the Education Department which he thought they ought to observe. To take the control of so large a sum from the elected representatives of the ratepayers who, hitherto, had been able to use the money in reduction of the rates, practically amounted to granting the power to the Education Department of imposing rates upon those localities.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: How does my hon. friend make up his £440,000?

*MR. CHARLES DOUGLAS said he would give the details to the right hon. Gentleman later on, but whether he was right or not in his figures he thought the Secretary for Scotland would agree that there was in the Bill a very considerable extension of the powers given to the Department for dealing with Scotch money. It was recognised elsewhere in the Bill that this great extension of the powers of the Department was to carry with it a greater security for the Department's action being in conformity with the opinion of the people in Scotland. Otherwise this Bill would constitute an almost impossible claim on behalf of the Department. They were most willing to follow the right hon. Gentleman in an educational raid upon whatever funds might be available for educational purposes, but they wanted to be sure that at the end the fruit of their victory would not be a system of indentured School Board labour. They wished to take some good security for having control in view of the very great additional power they were asked to give to the Department. In his judgment the possibility of consenting to the conditions of Part III. depended upon whether they were to be fully satisfied as to the effect of what was provided under Part IV. He welcomed the scheme provided under the latter part as an admission that more consultation was required by the Department than under present circumstances existed. The Parliamentary control was admittedly inadequate, and no one supposed that it was adequate. Once a year the subject of education was discussed in Committee of the House, and the action of the Department was generally debated only after it had been already taken. They had no real control of administration in the divisions which took place in Committee of the

House. For the most part the divisions were taken upon the ordinary Party lines, which had really less to do with Scotch education than with any other subject. Scottish opinion was often over-ruled; last year the right hon. Gentleman disposed of a sum of money that fell to Scottish education as an equivalent grant really against the opinion, practically, of all the non-official Scotch Members in this House. There had only been about three occasions during the last thirty years on which the opinions of Scotch Members had effected any serious change in the policy of the Department. It might be possible to strengthen Parliamentary control under this Bill, but whether that was so or not, he did not think the control they could exercise in the House of Commons could ever be adequate for the growing needs of educational work in Scotland, and it must be supplemented by more constant and more detailed consultation. The Bill admitted this, but he was not so sure that this measure, as it stood, adequately provided what was required in that respect.

As for the scheme of advisory councils, he did not agree with everything that had fallen from the hon. Member for the Border Burghs upon this point. He thought the idea which underlay this proposal was a sound and practicable one. The idea that they could create and should create an organised body of educational opinion for consultation about administrative action was a good one, and the function of any such body must obviously be purely an advisory function. But if it were known that in a matter of educational policy the opinion of Scotland was dead against the Education Department, he did not think so ill of that Department as to suppose that it would pursue a course to which Scottish opinion was opposed. In exercising these functions he thought those councils, if they were properly created, might usefully supplement the more authoritative but much less detailed control which this House had over Scotch education. He thought this proposal would create and focus educational opinion in Scotland by some such method of consultation. He believed that such a scheme as might exist in the Bill when it left their hands would be likely to bring the Department in much closer contact with the problems with which it had to deal. The existence of such councils offered to those who were engaged in the local work of education a position of real influence and an opportunity of getting at the discussion of large questions of policy, which he believed they would cordially welcome and which might be an additional inducement to men of ability and position to take part in the work of local educational bodies. He felt bound to ask those who opposed the scheme whether they believed that all these objects were being secured, as they ought to be secu ed, in Scotland now, and if not, he wished to know how those who objected to the creation of advisory councils thought they could make any progress towards attaining those most important objects. If those were sound and important objects, then they had to consider how far the provisions in this Bill really met the case.

In the first place, as to the constitution of these councils, he did not share the objection that was felt to giving the Universities a place on the board of such bodies. He thought it was very important that they should have such a place. They were the natural heart and centre of the educational life of Scotland, and it could not be advisable when they were trying to bring all their educational organisations together to leave the Universities out in the cold. The defects in the Scotch University system had been alluded to; he had for eighteen years worked in a Scotch University, and he was sure that whatever defects there might be in the Scotch University system, they would be best removed by bringing those Universities, which were indispensable to the intellectual and educational life of the country, into more and more living contact with what was going on educationally throughout the provinces, and throughout the whole country districts of Scotland. One or two points were not quite clear in regard to the representative element on those councils; he was glad the right hon. Gentleman had made the representative element definitely predominate; but he did not know why the county councils had been brought in. In a municipal Bill to municipalise education he could have understood the county council being brought in, but under this Bill, if they were to have a representative element, it should represent those, and those only, who were actually engaged in the administrative work of education and who were conversant with it. For the moment there might be on the county councils persons who had taken an active part in educational work in the various counties, but that might not always be so, and it was pretty certain that it would not always be so; and they would not always have as members of county councils those who had taken part in School Board work. Therefore, he thought the right hon. Gentleman ought to reconsider his proposals upon this point.

Why should there be four provincial councils? The reason could not be that there was a desire to associate the Universities with them, because the districts of the councils did not follow the districts of the Universities. Indeed, strictly speaking, the Universities of Scotland had no provincial districts. The University of Aberdeen might to some extent have a provincial district, but in the case of Edinburgh only 55 per cent. of the Scottish entrants came from that city itself or any county that could possibly be regarded as within an Edinburgh province, while the remainder came from all over the country. A really national council was what was wanted and what would work. On the other hand, a national council, considering the work it must do if it existed, must act very largely through provincial committees. He suggested that provincial committees could be appointed with power to create from themselves a national joint committee to consider matters of common interest and importance. Unless the provincial councils got power to act together in matters affecting them all, he did not think they would have a scheme which would really work well or satisfy the demand that existed in Scotland. There was no provision in the Bill for common action. If the Secretary for Scotland still stuck to his proposal for four provincial councils, he hoped he would not persist in preventing common action. Cynical and frivolous men had said that the right hon. Gentleman would keep the four provincial councils separate because he desired that their views should conflict, so that the views of the Scotch Education Department might the more easily prevail. He did not for a moment associate himself with that accusation. He was sure the right hon. Gentleman had brought in the scheme because he thought it was a good one, and that he really meant it to work. He thought, however, the right hon. Gentleman would find it easier to work with one council, or with four councils allowed to combine, than with four councils kept separate in their work. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would deal with the whole subject in the spirit of compromise which he generally displayed on such occasions and in such matters. It would be no way out of the difficulty to drop this part of the Bill, for, if he dropped it, he would greatly aggravate the difficulty that would exist for all of them in respect of the financial provisions of the Bill. He was confident that this part and the other parts also were capable of being dealt with, and would be dealt with, in Committee in such a way as to send out a really good Bill which would give the people of Scotland the opportunity of dealing with the educational needs of the country.

Sir CHARLES RENSHAW (Renfrewshire, W.) said he believed if there was any necessity for a council such as was suggested by the Bill, it would be infinitely better to have one strong council representing the new School Boards—very much in the way that they had a County Councils Association representing the different counties throughout Scotland—rather than one constituted in the somewhat indefinite way suggested. The hon. Member for North West Lanark thought there was no reason why members of the county councils should not go on the new provincial councils. He was himself a member of a county council, and he had been very much associated with county councils as a member of the County Councils Association, but he could not see why any special representation should be given either to counties or burghs on the provincial councils. It seemed to him that if they were to have anything of the kind established it ought to be one body, and that made as strong as possible. He had the gravest doubts as to the necessity for such a body, because he thought if it was called into existence at all it would have the effect of weakening the School Boards. If it was to be formed it should be one authority, accurately representing the views of the new School Boards, and entrusted with the duties which must be devolved on some central authority, such as the training of teachers.

The question to which he wished specially to refer was that of the area to be selected for the purpose of the new educational authority. Diverse views had been expressed by the hon. Members who had addressed the House on this matter. Having been associated with district councils and county councils in connection with local government work he thought it would be very much better if the county were taken as the unit for the new authority, with power, possibly subject to the sanction of the Secretary for Scotland, to subdivide itself into proper educational areas. He asked the House to remember that the districts which were to be taken as units for educational work were formed for the purpose of administering the Roads and Bridges Act and matters connected with public health. It never came into the mind of anyone when these districts were carried out for the purposes of local government that they would be applied to educational purposes. He instanced his own county as showing the undesirability of adopting that method without any consideration at all, as the area for educational purposes. In the county of Renfrew there were two big burghs—Paisley and Greenock—and the county naturally divided itself into two districts, the upper and the lower. They had some experience in the working out of educational schemes, and it had been found that the existing divisions of the county were quite unsuitable for educational purposes. His view was that the best area to take was the county, and that the new educational authorities, whenever they had been elected, should make out their own schemes. If such a scheme as that were adopted he should be in favour of postponing the operation of the Bill for a year, and appointing a small Commission to inquire into the best way of grouping the areas throughout the whole of Scotland for educational work. That must involve a short delay, but the county councils would be in possession of all the facts, and it would give a proper system of division for educational purposes in the future. They would also be able to make it perfectly certain that a great deal of the usefulness of their work would not be dissipated by hard and fast lines of division.

There was one point in connection with the subject of areas that he would like the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland to give the House some assurance on; and that was that full power would be given for co-operation between neighbouring districts. He looked upon these larger areas as likely to be fraught with good consequences for education in Scotland. He was a member of one of the first School Boards in Scotland, elected in 1873, and remained a member for twenty-one years. He had watched with regret the way in which the School Boards had tended to go down in public estimation of late years. The fact was, the Department had laid its chilling hand on the work of the small School Boards, and the people of Scotland had come to realise that the power was not in the hands of the School Boards, but in that of the Department and of the teachers. That was a great danger to future educational progress in Scotland, and he sincerely hoped that one result of the Bill would be to entrust the new and larger educational authorities with real responsibility for the work they had to do. He appealed to the Government not to cramp their efforts by swathing them round with Departmental bandages. Forty-six per cent. of the total expenditure incurred in Scotland for educational work was raised by rates, and he contended that there ought to be greater freedom granted to the local representatives in connection with the system of educational management.

With regard to the financial proposals in the Bill, he thought they were without precedent. It was unfortunate that although they were to have district administration, they were to have a parochial rate, and an antiquated method of levying that rate. All the elaborate system of deductions under which the amount of rates were veiled and disguised were to be continued. If the district was to be taken as a unit he should say that, so far as current expenditure was concerned, the district of the county and the burgh should be the authority through whom the rates should be collected, and collected not subject to the deductions to which he had referred. The rates should be uniform throughout the burgh or the district, and should be levied on the gross assessment value, except in the case of agricultural lands. It would then be made perfectly clear that those who were called upon to elect representatives on the School Board knew what the rate really was. In his own county, where they had eleven classified parishes, if the system of financing in the Bill was adopted, he would defy anyone to make clear what it was the various ratepayers would be called upon to pay. What was wanted in order to secure economy in administration was that there should be a uniform municipal, district, or county rate, so that everyone would be able to know that he was paying the same rate as his neighbour. No doubt questions would be raised in Committee as to the way in which it was proposed to charge the amount of existing debts on the parishes. He could not bring himself to see that it would be equitable to throw the entire charge on the district or county as a unit. The difficulty arose not so much as to the disparity of the amount as to the number of years over which the debt charges were spread. In his own Division of the county he found that, in respect of repayments for debt, the charge varied from ·64 of a penny to 4·94d. Over the whole county it amounted to 4d. in one district and 3d. in another. The burgh of Renfrew long ago paid off almost the whole of its debt, and at the present time the amount of charge per head of the population was only 4s. 8d., but in the case of the landward part of the parish of Renfrew, where an enormous population had grown up, the total amount of debt, all of which had recently been incurred, amounted to over £6 per head of the population. Therefore, it would be a great hardship if they were to say that Renfrew burgh and Renfrew landward were to be placed in the same position. In regard to other financial questions raised in other parts of the Bill, he found himself in substantial agreement with the hon. Member for North West Lanark. The equivalent grant represented 1½d. in the £ on the total assessable value in Scotland. That grant had been spent through a long series of years by the county and municipal authorities for very useful purposes, and it had relieved the rates to that extent. If that money was to be taken away now and put into the central Education Fund, it was perfectly obvious that the whole of the amount would have to be collected by additional rates directly, and in the future. If the equivalent grant was added to the new Education Fund, was there any guarantee that, in every district in every part of Scotland, the money would be needed for immediate educational purposes? He did not think so. It would, he believed, take several years before there would be a call on that money for educational purposes. If that were so, he asked the House to pause before they agreed to the proposition that this money was to be taken away from the authorities who had hitherto spent it usefully for practical purposes, and placed in the Education Fund. There was another reason why this £100,000 should not be placed in the central fund. It would check the tendency to extravagance on the part of the new authorities, if these had to levy a rate for every new expenditure that was required. The greatest blot on the Bill was that the newly created fund was placed too much under the control of the Education Department, and that the hands of the new authorities were tied in every conceivable way. He contended that that was a wrong thing. The money should be made available to those who would carry out their extended work under the new educational system in Scotland on a fair and equitable basis, such a basis that the local authorities should feel the responsibility they incurred in administration. When they were about to make an educational revolution in Scotland they ought to be certain that the new authorities would be so strong and so representative that they need not hesitate to trust them with the responsibility of administering the funds which ought to be placed at their disposal.

He should like to ask his right hon. friend whether the sanitary provisions of the measure had been carefully considered with regard to their effect on the existing system of local government. He had some experience of local government, and one thing he hated above all others was two authorities coming in and doing the same work. That occurred in connection with the administration of the Factory Acts in Scotland. The Home Office had a certain amount of power, and the local sanitary authorities had also a certain amount of power; but he did not think it was a good thing for the factory system of Scotland that that arrangement obtained. Up to the present the whole authority with reference to the sanitation of schools rested with the borough and county authorities. This Bill proposed to put responsibility for sanitation not only on the School Boards but also on the Department. He ventured to submit that that was undesirable. If extended powers were to be given in regard to the sanitary inspection of schools, let them establish a system by which the work could be carried out by the School Boards. He would object strongly to anything in the nature of a dual authority. He thanked the House for the indulgence with which they had listened to him; and he heartily hoped that the measure would really contribute to the development and success of education in Scotland.

MR. HALDANE (Haddingtonshire) said that the Bill, and the debate which had taken place on it, presented one feature at least of great general interest. It showed how much controversy might be inherent in a non-controversial measure. The speech of the hon. Baronet who had just spoken must make the Secretary for Scotland feel that he would do well to speak with the enemy within the gates, and also to take counsel with hon. Members on that side of the House, as they might come to his assistance when the Committee stage was reached. Everybody wanted this Bill and everybody approved of some feature in it; but nobody was satisfied with all the details. The controversy was not running on Party lines; and he hoped that in Committee the right hon. Gentleman would show himself as skilful as he generally was in rallying round him support from various parts of the House that would be given to him in return for the consideration of other points in the Bill, in order that by the co-operation of the intelligence of Scotland on both sides of the House they should be able to produce a really workmanlike measure.

What was the feature of the Bill on which general criticism had been concentrated? No severer way of putting it could have come from any hon. Member than came from the hon. Baronet as regarded that feature of the Bill which had attracted so much attention. He meant the position which the Scottish Education Department retained, in some respects in an aggravated form, under the new education scheme. Let them contrast the condition of Scotland to-day under these propositions with the position of Wales at the hands of the English Education Department as they read of it in *The Times* newspaper that morning. Wales was in controversy with the Education Department; yet the Education Department was not afraid, notwithstanding its controversy with Wales, to recognise the right of Wales to be consulted very largely in administrative matters. The Welsh Intermediate Education Act of 1899, laid the foundation of that principle, the principle being to treat Wales as a nationality entitled to have some control in her own educational system, to be looked at as a whole and as having a national opinion which ought to make itself manifest in the shaping of the educational system of the country. By the Act of 1902 the existing machinery was recognised, and to-day Wales was recognised by the Department as a nation with national characteristics of education. The unfortunate Scotchmen were in a very different position. They had a very able Education Department, which was too powerful in the past and too powerful to-day. Under this Bill the Education Department would retain the uncontrolled disposition of very large funds, the application of which would shape to a very large extent the educational system of Scotland. There was no way of getting out of the fact that the position of the Education Department in London would be just as powerful relatively to Scotland under the new system as it was under the present system. Like his hon. and learned friend the Member for the Border Burghs he should like to see a system established in Scotland which would be so strong and so powerful that no Education Department would be able to neglect it. It was easily possible to take the School Boards and set them off one against the other. Again, the history of Scottish education since 1872 had been that the teaching profession and the Education Department were getting stronger and stronger at the expense of the representative element in education in Scotland. It might have been expected that the time had arrived for the construction of a scheme under which that would have been met to some extent. It would have been expected, for instance, that the new School Boards with large areas would have some machinery by which they could meet in council, and possess a central organisation, just as Wales had, to determine the main features of the educational policy of Scotland.

Let them consider the application of all the funds which would be distributed by the Scottish Education Department. Surely the principle on which those funds were to be applied ought to be the very thing which ought to be pronounced upon by representatives of Scottish educational opinion. He should not have been content to take the representatives of the new School Boards; but he should desire to see the expert opinion of Scotland — and there was a great deal of the very finest expert opinion in Scotland—brought into play in this matter. He should have liked to have seen the Universities taking their part in those deliberations, which would shape the educational system of the country from top to bottom. In that way a scheme would be determined in accordance with the sentiments of Scotland in connection with education which had its own characteristics just as much as education in Wales had. Instead of that, they were left under this system a Scottish Education Department divorced from any contact with Scottish educational opinion excepting so far as that opinion became known to the representative of the Department permanently settled in Edinburgh. He was very glad to learn that the right hon. Gentleman proposed that a real representative of the Department should permanently reside in Scotland, and be accessible to Scottish educationists. Nothing short of a very much more complete decentralisation of the powers of the Department was, however, adequate to the necessities of the case. He quite sympathised with the desire of the right hon. Gentleman to have his officials and officers in London during the sitting of Parliament. They did not ask that that should be altered; if that must be, let it be. But they did ask that some more real control in the shaping of the educational policy of Scotland should be given to Scottish opinion.

There was another feature of the Bill which gave rise to a great deal of discussion, but which seemed to him to present a much more satisfactory result. He thought the Secretary for Scotland was to be congratulated on the way the religious difficulty had been met. He had more sympathy than his hon. friend the Member for the Border Burghs with the position of denominations in Scotland. For instance, he thought that the Episcopalians, who were a considerable body in the large towns, had been rather badly treated by the Scottish School Boards. In Edinburgh, for example, the Episcopalians, who were a very representative element there, desired that in one school at least they should be allowed to give their own religious teaching instead of sending their children to schools governed by the Presbyterian majority on the School Board, where they would be taught in accordance with the Cowper-Temple clause. The answer was that that was not desirable, and it was not done. The clause of the right hon. Gentleman would, however, allow the local education authorities to give some recognition to voluntary schools; and if that policy commended itself to the authorities then it would be possible for recognition to be given to the teaching of denominational religion in voluntary schools without upsetting the system which prevailed in the Board schools. Having said that, he desired to express his entire concurrence with what his hon. friend the Member for the Border Burghs said with reference to secularism. He proposed to leave the denominations to look after their own business; and he believed that the time was very near when they would have a very substantial majority in the House of Commons in favour of the conclusion that it was impossible for the State to go on tinkering any longer, and making failure after failure in the attempt to solve the impossible problem as to how the secular arm was to deal with the religious difficulty. He thought that the Secretary for Scotland was to be congratulated on the Bill as it stood, not because it was not open to the criticism of his hon. and learned friend, but because that criticism was the necessary outcome of the rooted tendency of the Scottish people to recognise denominational teaching in the schools.

As to the question of areas, the difficulty arose from the fact that the areas were not selected for educational purposes. He knew of cases where the secondary school was the secondary school of large districts on the right and left of it, which now found itself on the border, and would therefore be cut off from a large body of the children which it served. He knew no way of getting out of the difficulty which arose except by allowing powers of combination of a more explicit kind than were given in the Bill, and he hoped the Government would take the initiative in Committee in devising means of getting out of what was a very serious practical difficulty. He also hoped that the problem of the training of teachers would be put on a better basis. It was a perfect scandal that the training of teachers should be left haphazard as it was at the present time. Then, with regard to the provincial councils, he stood strongly by them. He knew the right hon. Gentleman was not likely to yield on the point of a really strong central council, and therefore he welcomed the provincial councils as a buffer against the Department. He agreed that these provincial councils were shorn of much power, but the advantage of having them, he thought, would be soon seen, and it might be that something might be done to strengthen their position in Committee. He would like to see their opinion invited upon all the minutes, and he would like a clause to be put into the Bill saying that all minutes should be sent down for the consideration of the provincial councils, so that the opinion of Scotland might be known with regard to them. He would not be doing his duty as a Scottish representative if he did not state how much opinion in Scotland was resenting the growing dominance of the Education Department. The Department was a sufficiently able Department, but it ought to get more into touch with popular feeling in the future than it had done in the past. In the management clauses the right hon. Gentleman had a most difficult problem to solve. While the right hon. Gentleman had probably done wisely to keep some local management, he must reconsider the situation carefully in the light of the expressions of opinion which were heard on this subject. Certainly the appointment of teachers should be outside the scope of the managers' functions, and he hoped the Bill would be made clear on that point. In its main features he thought the right hon. Gentleman had produced a measure which would make the organisation of the Scottish system a little more up-to-date than it was. Secondary education in Scotland was utterly unorganised, and his doubt was whether there was sufficient provision for bringing it into such a unified form as would afford an adequate system. They had, however, a beginning of a new system, and it was their business to make all they could of it, and, when they had got it, to use it to their utmost capacity.

*SIR JOHN TUKE (Edinburgh and St. Andrews' Universities): I would not have intervened at this stage were it not that the hon. Baronet the Member for Renfrew expressed doubts as to the propriety of providing for the medical inspection of schools and school children. I consider such a provision to be of the utmost importance, and my thanks are due to the Secretary for Scotland for introducing the provision into the Bill. I regard it very much as a suggestion to all School Boards to appoint medical officers for this purpose. Anyone who has studied the Report on Physical Training presented to the House a year ago must realise the fact that a serious amount of disease exists amongst the school children in the large cities and towns. I cannot homologate all the statements made in this Report, but there exists in it sufficient evidence to warrant the introduction into this Bill of a clause permitting the expenditure of money on medical inspection. I trust if this Bill becomes law that every School Board will institute such inspection. In so doing the School Boards will only be following the example of London, Bradford, and many other cities in England. It has been suggested that the work of the school medical inspector might clash with the sanitary authorities. This has not occurred in the English cities I have alluded to, and, in point of fact, the duties of the two classes of officers would be entirely different. The school inspector would deal with individuals, which is outside the province of the sanitary inspector. It is not the duty, nor is it in the power, of the latter to look into the condition of individuals, for instance—it is not the duty of the sanitary inspector to examine into the condition of the eyesight of the children. This is a matter of great importance, for not only may visual errors become aggravated by school discipline, but it is open to question whether certain parts of the course of instruction are not detrimental. I allude to the teaching of sewing at a too early age. But, Sir, the whole question of school hygiene needs to be regarded seriously, and the first steps towards efficiency in this respect is the appointment of medical inspectors. Before I sit down I desire to allude to what I consider to be a serious omission in the Bill, the absence of any provision for the alimentation of underfed children. I do not think this is the proper stage to discuss this point in all its relationships, but I purpose putting down an Amendment to Clause 31 which will raise the whole question.

Mr. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.) said that although Members were agreed in desiring to accept the Bill, the Second Reading debate afforded an opportunity of calling attention to points upon which controversy might arise in Committee. He would divide his remarks, like a Scotch sermon, under three heads—the good points, the bad points, and the doubtful points of the Bill. One of the very best features of the measure was the proposed consolidation of the different funds applicable to education. The various Acts and Minutes which had been passed since 1890 had introduced such an amount of complication into Scotch educational finance as to render it beyond the comprehension of anybody in the House except perhaps of the Secretary for Scotland and one of the hon. Members for Lanark. The Bill would simplify all that, and in future it would be possible to know the amount of money that was being spent and the purposes to which it was being applied. A consolidation of authorities would also be effected, and it was much to the credit of the county and town councils that they had raised no complaint against the provisions by which they would be dispossessed of the educational functions at present exercised by them. The Association of County Councils had approved of the creation of an *ad hoc* body although it deprived them of the administration of technical education. The clauses relating to endowments were valuable, and ought to lead to considerable improvement. Clause 42 also contained a valuable provision by which the Education Department would be enabled to call upon a local authority to show that it had made adequate provision for secondary and technical instruction. The further development of secondary and technical instruction was of supreme importance, and considerable improvement would probably result from its closer association with elementary education and the provision of further funds. The abolition of the cumulative vote, which was generally admitted to have worked badly, was another good point in the Bill; and a further merit was that everywhere in Scotland there would be an authority expressly created for educational purposes. The working of the English Act of 1902 had already shown how much better it would have been had a similar course been followed in England, instead of the work of education being cast upon authorities already overburdened. The unification in the administration of education in Scotland would be real, because they had a body specially competent to deal with the matter, whereas in England the alleged unification was a sham, because the county and town councils were obliged to delegate their functions to committees and were unable to exercise real control. An incidental benefit was that in Scotland, by their presence on the educational authority, women would be able to continue to give valuable assistance in connection with the education of girls. Altogether the people of England might well wish they had an Act framed on the lines of the Scotch Bill instead of the measure passed in 1902. The present Bill not only followed the old lines and preserved Scotch traditions, but it was drafted in accordance with the popular opinion of the country; and, because it recognised popular control and rested upon popular sympathy, it would probably work well.

Among the points which would certainly require consideration in Committee was the important provision contained in Clause 38 with regard to the funds applicable to Scotch education generally, over and above the Parliamentary grant. The funds there dealt with were to be placed under the absolute control of the Department. The money provided under the Acts of 1890 and 1892 had hitherto been under the control of the local authorities, and stood on a different footing from the funds under the control of the Education Department. The grant under the Act of 1890 could be applied, at the discretion of the local authority, either to technical education or to the relief of rates; and, as a rule, the authorities had applied the greater part of the money to education. Some of the local authorities, including the town council of Aberdeen, desired to retain the power of applying a portion of the money to the rates, if they thought fit so to do. Personally, he had never favoured that view, but the fact that it was entertained in some quarters ought to be stated. But it was going a great deal further, and trifling much more emphatically with the view of local authorities in Scotland to take the control of the money under the Acts of 1890 and 1892 entirely out of the hands of the local authorities, who not unreasonably resented the proposal. Their view was that they had local knowledge and local responsibility, and that they had discharged that responsibility in a manner of which the Department had had no reason to complain, and which on the whole had given satisfaction in the respective areas; they desired to know, therefore, why they should be deprived of the power they had enjoyed, and which had done much to stimulate local interest and local initiative. The county councils were willing to resign the administration of this Act. It was taken away from them and given to the district School Boards by the Bill. They thought a special authority was better, but they did say that as the money had been well administered in the locality no cause had been shown for taking it away from the locality and giving it to the Department. Personally, he agreed with hon. Members who had spoken in thinking that the Department had too much power, and they would be giving too great a function to the Department if they entrusted it with the uncontrolled administration of the whole of this money. He did not think the laying of the Minutes on the Table of this House or the creation of provincial councils would check the autocracy of the Scotch Education Department. He acknowledged the great zeal, ability, and energy of the permanent head of the Education Department, for he did not think they had a more efficient public servant, and they were indebted to him for the patriotism, talent, and industry he had shown. They could not, however, always be sure of having an equally competent Scotchman at the head of the Department. He thought better results would be obtained by leaving a large share of this money to be locally administered. That part of this money which had hitherto been applied in aid of the relief of rates had fallen entirely upon occupiers in burghs, but if a rate had to be imposed to provide for local expenditure which hitherto the locality had provided for out of these funds, it would fall upon owners and occupiers alike. Therefore it was suggested by the burghs that, should this provision of the Bill be carried, arrangements ought to be made in the interests of the occupiers to ensure that that relief which they had hitherto had as against the owners should not be lost to them in the future. In Aberdeen it would make a difference of £800, and in a city like Glasgow it would make a still greater difference. But there was another aspect of the question. Great centres of population like Glasgow, Edinburgh, and Dundee contributed very largely to the funds which the Bill proposed to assign to the Scotch Education Department to administer. The taxable revenue from these great cities formed part of the fund which the Education Department might spend, and these cities might reasonably say that as they contributed a great deal more than other districts, regard ought to be had to their population in distributing the funds. It would be in the power of the Department to apply the money more largely to other parts of Scotland and leave the cities to shift for themselves. No doubt the Department would have a reasonable regard to the population and needs of the great cities, but the cities should feel that they had some further security which could be given by entrusting the administration of a large part of this fund to the School Boards in those cities.

There were two or three points in which the Bill wanted amendment. There was the power given to the district School Boards to apply money in aid of voluntary schools. However much one wished that no question of religious controversy should arise, they could not shut their eyes to facts, and already this question had been raised in Scotland, and would no doubt be raised in Committee on this Bill. His hon. friend had already pointed out that if they gave this power to the district School Boards they were almost certain to bring not only into the debates of the School Boards but also into the electoral contests for members of those boards an element of dissension which had not yet existed, and he thought that would be a very unfortunate thing. They had had practically up to the present no sectarian differences in Scotland, and he was afraid that this provision would necesarily involve the taking of sides upon religious questions on Scotch School Boards where there were present the representatives of a considerable population interested in voluntary schools. Would it not be much better that the support of voluntary schools should come more out of other sources rather than from one which was likely to lead to the introduction of religious differences? There was another point in the Bill which might give rise to some trouble. Section 39 laid down the purposes to which the Scotch Education Department might apply the very large sums it had to administer, and that section contained words which would enable it to make grants to sectarian institutions giving secondary education. The Liberal Party had always protested against giving any public money to any sectarian schools for secondary education; and they could not acquiesce in the provision enabling the Department to make grants to sectarian secondary schools. They had always protested against the grant to King's College, London, because it was to a small extent of a sectarian character, but that difficulty was removed by King's College getting rid of its sectarian character. They had always protested against any grants being made to sectarian institutions, and that was one of the points which ought to be expunged from this Bill. The section fixing the election to the district School Board at the same time as the county council or the burgh council election, however it might operate in the counties, would not work well in the burghs. The Scottish burghs had expressed a strong opinion that both elections would suffer in consequence. It was quite true that in countries where they had a multiplicity of elections it might be an advantage to have several elections at the same time in order to relieve people from being in a continual electoral turmoil. But they had not so many elections in this country as all that, for they only came round once in three years. The issues were quite different to those for which they were elected on the borough council, and the subject had nothing in common. Borough council elections were enough to engage the whole mind of the district, and so was the School Board election, and the view of the Scotch burghs was that this system would introduce great confusion and prevent the real will and mind of the people being duly expressed if the two elections were taken at the same time. They were of opinion that it would be a great deal better to have the School Board election by itself. When they got to the Committee stage he should be prepared to adduce the reasons which the Scotch burghs put forward for that view, and he hoped they would have weight with the Secretary for Scotland.

With regard to the establishment of provincial councils, after the various opinions which had been expressed upon this point by Scotch Members, he thought the Secretary for Scotland would be pretty safe in adhering to his proposal. In his opinion to have four provincial councils would give much less efficacy to the system than if they had one national council. Each of the four councils would be comparatively weak, and it was very doubtful whether the best men in a locality would be induced to become candidates for such councils, because their powers would be very small. None of them would speak with any great authority upon Scotch questions, and they would not have sufficient influence to be any kind of a check upon the Scotch Education Department. He thought it would be a much better plan to have one national council, because if they had four councils their proceedings would be of so little interest that the newspapers would hardly care to report them. Of course it was said that the Highlands wanted a body for themselves. He quite agreed that there was something to be said for that suggestion, but the object could be obtained in another way. If there was a national council it could be allowed to appoint four district committees, and the needs of the Highlands could be met by a committee sitting at Inverness. It could also be provided that the council instead of always meeting at Edinburgh should meet from time to time in other centres. If the council met at Inverness sometimes it could consider the wants of the Highlands. In that way they would help to stimulate Scotch local opinion on education and to create a more lively interest in education than unfortunately at present existed in Scotland. Those who had tried to ascertain what Scotch opinion on education was must have been struck by the fact that there were very few people in Scotland who took an interest in the general education of the country. He hoped the Lord Advocate would adhere to the proposal, although he thought it might be improved by setting up one council.

In regard to the question of areas, great diversity of opinion had been expressed on the subject. The hon. Member for Banffshire argued in favour of keeping the parish, and the hon. Members for Renfrewshire and North West Lanarkshire were in favour of the county. No doubt there was a great deal to be said for both. He would suggest whether some scheme might not be found to meet the objection raised against the district as being too small for secondary education. The county was too large an area for elementary education. The safer plan would be to take the parish as the primary unit for elementary education, to unite with a free hand the parishes where they were small, and so to create areas in many cases of the size of the present districts. The efficient area for secondary education so as to enable the union of parishes to form a federated body for the area, was the county or two small counties, and in that way they might organise secondary education for the larger area. By this means they would preserve the benefit of unity. That would retain the merits of the scheme while meeting the objections which had been taken to it.

Lastly, there was the question of delegation to managers. He admitted that there was great difficulty in that question, and he would like to keep an open mind upon it. It was an important question, especially in regard to the appointment of teachers. There was a strong feeling that the appointment of teachers ought to go to the School Board. He thought the Secretary for Scotland knew that the borrowing powers ought to be somewhat enlarged. They would be able to administer finance in a better way if they had larger powers. None of these points —not even those which he thought were blemishes on the Bill as it stood—raised any Party issue. Even that question which might seem to raise a Party issue —the question of permitting the School Boards to give aid to voluntary schools— was not really a Party question in Scotland. If it became a Party question there it would only be because it was a Party question in England. He did not believe that Scotch Liberals and Tories were divided on that question. Therefore he hoped they might promise the Secretary for Scotland that the Bill, when it went into Committee, would be discussed even on those doubtful points in a perfectly calm and dispassionate manner. He trusted, however, that the Secretary for Scotland would not use his English majority to carry points against what was obviously the feeling of the Scottish Members. If such a Bill as this, recognising popular control and a specially *ad hoc* authority, had been proposed for England, it would have been passed without much controversy. If he might sum up the different ways in which educational problems were treated in England and Scotland, he would say that in England there was passion without progress; in Scotland dumbness without discord, or rather "dryness without discord." He preferred the dryness of Scotland to the passion of England.

Mr. MAXWELL (Dumfries-shire) said little had been stated in favour of the Amendment, but it appeared to him that it raised by far the most important question in connection with the Bill, namely, what the district was to be for educational purposes. What considerations should they keep in view in deciding what the district was to be? They should consider not only the area, but population. In the Middle Ward of Lanarkshire, for example, where there was a population of 320,000, the district area might work very well. On the other hand there were districts which were sparsely populated and where the same arrangement would not be applicable. In his own constituency there was a district with a population of only a little over 6,000. In that case very little would be done for secondary education under the proposal now made. His own view was that the best area to take as a basis for this purpose was the county. Out of the thirty-three counties in Scotland there were twenty-three with a population under 100,000, and in some of these the population was so scattered that it would be impossible for the purpose of secondary education to take the county area. He instanced the conditions in respect of population in the county of Kincardine and in the Stewartry of Kirkcudbright as illustrating the difficulties with which they had to deal in this matter. This question was considered the other day by the County Councils Association, and, although a unanimous finding was not arrived at, the finding indicated that the district area was not regarded as satisfactory. There were twenty-one counties represented, and eleven voted in favour of a School Board for the county with power to divide, and ten for a School Board for the district with power to unite. He thought it was pretty clear that county opinion was in favour of the larger area. There was, however, a great deal to be said in favour of having large areas divided rather than smaller ones united, because when small bodies were set up it was rather difficult to bring them together. He wished to look at the question from a practical point of view. In the debate very slight reference had been made to the work done by the county committees to systematise secondary and technical education in Scotland.

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the debate stood adjourned till this Evening's Sitting.

EVENING SITTING.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

[Second Reading.]

Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on Question [2nd May], "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Question again proposed.

Mr. MAXWELL, continuing his speech, said, he had been a member of two School Boards and a county committee in twenty years, and he was not inclined to run one against the other. The work of the county committees could not be disregarded, but in this Bill the county committees were almost entirely ignored. The only reference to them which he could find in the Bill was in Section 48, but so far as he could see no provision was made for continuing the bursaries which had been given by them. The work of the county committees had to a certain extent extended the opportunities of secondary and technical education, and he took it that what they all desired to see brought about was that higher education, whether secondary or technical, should be within the reach of every child in the country. From that point of view there was a good deal to be said in favour of having a larger area. The best secondary education in Scotland was now being given in the higher class schools and the endowed schools, which were schools receiving certain grants from the Department under the Minute of 1899. There were at the present time in Scotland fifty-nine schools receiving grants, and it should be possible for any boy or girl who was found fit to benefit from them to find their way into those schools, and if the district area was taken it would be a much more difficult matter than at present. In his own county there were five districts and in the county town there was a very well equipped secondary school, and at the present time the county committee was as far as possible bringing the clever children of those districts into that school. But under this Bill the tendency would undoubtedly be to set up in each district a secondary school, which would be a wasteful proceeding as they would not be so effective as one really good school for the county. It might be said that the other districts would suffer, but in the other districts there were higher grade departments which would not be allowed to suffer, and in those higher grade departments, to a certain extent, a good education was given. If they adopted the smaller areas a very great difficulty would arise with regard to fitting in the curriculum of the schools with the higher schools. There was not even power given in this Bill to the different School Boards to combine for the support of one of these higher-class schools. There was a provision that they might charge higher fees for pupils coming from outside their districts, but there was no power given to put these schools into combined districts.

The question of technical education was a question of very considerable difficulty. In Scotland there were three really good technical institutions, one in Edinburgh, one in Aberdeen, and one in Glasgow. They were not, perhaps, quite up to the German standard, but they were fairly efficient institutions for technical education, and if technical education was to be advanced throughout the country it must be worked in co-operation with those central institutions. To some extent this had been done in Fife and in Aberdeen, and in Galloway agriculture was being taught in connection with the West of Scotland Technical College at the present time. That was now being worked by three county committees, but when this Bill came into operation there would be no less than eleven School Boards interested, and the result would be that the smaller outlying districts must suffer. It would be more difficult to get teachers and there would be eleven authorities trying to carry out the work which was now being carried out by three. In the interests of economy it was better that it should be carried out by three county committees as at the present time. He feared that if this Bill passed in its present form there would be retrogression instead of progress. It was not clear from the Bill how far the West of Scotland Technical College was to be assisted and run by a combination of authorities. At the present moment eight county committees contributed and had a right to nominate governors. When this Bill became law thirty School Boards would be entitled to nominate governors, but no provision had been made as to their contributing. Another argument in favour of larger areas was that in a small area there might be a conflict of opinion as to the industry to be taught, but if a county area was taken all industries would have a fair chance of being taught. The larger areas affected not only technical but to some extent elementary education. He foresaw that in small areas outlying districts would derive much benefit from this Bill. One great advantage of a larger area was the prospect of advancement for the teachers, a prospect they had not at the present time. The chances of promotion now were very small indeed, but in his opinion it would come about that those areas that were now suffering most would derive the largest benefit from this Bill.

The training of teachers was a matter of great importance, and it was improbable that the present system could be maintained. The churches had done good work in the training colleges which they founded and maintained, but almost all the funds for those colleges were now derived from the State. He should much regret to see those training colleges made over to the State and worked as a State institution. In his opinion the solution of that problem lay in the ability of each local authority to maintain a training college of its own. It was rather remarkable that there should be such a marked dependency on the Department by the school authorities in this Bill. In England the education monies were left free to the authority to use as they wished, but under this Bill the whole of this money was put into the fund of the Education Department and dealt with from time to time by that Department, without the consent of which the education authority could do nothing, not even pay for the board of a shepherd's child who came down to school from the hills. He would be the last to say a word against the Scottish Education Department, but he was of opinion that it would not in the end be to the advantage of the education of Scotland if the powers of the educational authorities were so confined. The fortieth Section of the Bill seemed to him rather like the thin end of the wedge. They might under that section find Codes introduced in connection with the secondary schools. In Scotland they had had quite enough of Codes with regard to elementary schools, and he did not want to see them introduced in the higher schools. The whole matter came back to what was to be the size of the district. If the districts were to be small it might not be right to trust them too much, but if the district were large they would call forth the best intellect and the best people who would take an interest in the schools, and they could be trusted to a very large extent. In large districts also it would be necessary to have managers, but in small districts of four or five parishes not only would managers be out of place, but, like the fifth wheel in a coach, be a source of endless friction. He quite agreed that the managers, if managers there were, should not be entrusted with the power either to employ or dismiss teachers, but on the other hand he would like to see large districts delegate large powers to managers.

He thought that provincial councils were quite unnecessary if the area was made sufficiently large. The danger was either that the powers entrusted to them would be so small that their opinion would be of little use, or the powers entrusted to them would be so large that they would interfere with the School Boards, and if the School Boards were interfered with in that way the utility of the provincial councils would be gone. With regard to the central council which had been stated to be the keystone of education in Scotland, its constitution had been sketched to the House. It was to be composed apparently of representatives of the Universities, of the teachers, and of the School Boards. He was afraid that there would be a permanent body of professors and one or two other persons in the educational centre where the council met —it might be Glasgow—and that they would not want to be dictated to, and such a condition of things would curb the usefulness of the large School Boards. And if such a body as this divided itself into committees all over the country, there would be less likelihood of the local committee taking any steps on their own initiative, as they would always be looking to these committees to advise them. He thought that no impediment should be placed between the local education authorities and this House, and in this regard he trusted the Government would not make a determined stand against some modification of the districts. He felt convinced that if the different districts were invested with considerable powers of initiative, and that if some funds were placed at their free disposal, Scotland in that way would best work out her own salvation.

MR. CROMBIE (Kincardineshire) said he wished to congratulate the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland in having introduced an Education Bill which in its essential features was non-controversial. If it were not controversial in some of its details, he would really believe that the Scotch people had lost that interest in education which had been their salvation hitherto. He should like to say a word or two on what was perhaps a more controversial point than any other, and that was on the question of areas. It was an obvious criticism that some of the areas might be too large and some too small. What was the remedy? It was that if they were to have an *ad hoc* body, why not an *ad hoc* district? He quite admitted that that would be much the best solution of the question; but he very much doubted whether it was altogether practicable. It seemed to him that in this matter of choosing a district, there was the same difficulty as in choosing a house. There was a well known proverb which said that "fools built houses, and wise men lived in them." There were considerable difficulties, in his own county of Kincardineshire, in taking the county as the area, because two of the districts on Deeside were separated from the county town of Stonehaven by a mountain range; and if there was a central school at Stonehaven, pupils would have to take the train from Deeside to Aberdeen, and another train from that city to Stonehaven. Taking it all round, therefore, the county district presented a better area than the county. He hoped, however, that the Government would grant some elasticity in the system, so that it might be possible to join two small districts together, and that in other large districts they might be split up into smaller separate districts. Further, two neighbouring districts should be allowed to elect a joint committee of their different School Boards in order to arrange a scheme of secondary education common to them all. Where the districts were very big, he believed that it would be impossible to have fair representation on the School Boards, owing to the expense entailed on members; and he hoped that the Government would accept an Amendment making it possible for the travelling expenses of the members of the boards to be paid. It seemed to him that the present position of the managers was perfectly impossible, for whatever these managers were going to do, they were, at any rate, going to incur expense; and there would be considerable latitude of responsibility on the part of managers not appointed by the School Board. He thought that by far the best plan would be that where managers had to be selected, they should be selected entirely by the School Board, and not by outside bodies. On the question of School Boards taking over the debts of various parishes, an exception was made of the debts on buildings. These school buildings would be taken over by the new district authority, and their rates to that extent would be saved, while the unfortunate parishes would have to pay for the school buildings and the rate as well. He hoped that the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary in his reply would be able to see his way to say something on that point which would ease the minds of the present School Boards. He was very glad that the Bill made such very fair provision for the teachers, and he was gratified that the School Boards would be able to add to the pensions of the teachers. When the Superannuation Bill was before the House he moved an Amendment to that effect, but it was rejected; and he was glad, therefore, that it had now been practically accepted.

What the hon. Baronet the Member for Renfrewshire had very properly described as the most important blot on the Bill, was the complete control given to the Education Department over the School Fund. That was a retrograde step. This Fund amounted to £500,000, part of which was at present administered by the local authorities. The Bill took away the money from the local authorities and gave them no say in the expenditure. He had no sympathy with part of the money being taken for the relief of rates. He thought that the autocracy of the Scotch Education Department had been one of the blots on the education system of Scotland. He wanted to make no personal attack on the officers of the Department. All of them regretted that they were to lose the eminent services of Sir Henry Craik, who had left his mark on Scotch education; but when all that had been said, the fact remained that the influence of the Department had been the scourge of Scotch education. If the Scotch educational system had formerly been chastised with whips, it was now to be scourged with scorpions. Of course it was said that Parliament had control over Scotch education; but he would ask what was the significance of a Minute of the Department lying on the Table of this House for so many days. For all practical purposes it might as well lie on the top of Ben Nevis. He remembered that ten or twelve years ago they could raise a discussion on Scotch education after twelve o'clock, but that was impossible now, and that disability would be perpetuated under the present Bill. It was said that the provincial councils were to be a check on the higher education in Scotland. That he entirely denied. They would prove only a delusion and a snare; they could never have a real control over the development of the higher teaching any more than the committee of commercial experts which the Board of Trade called in as a useful advisory body controlled the Board of Trade. He hoped that the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland would give Parliament complete control over the Education Department, and allow the local bodies some control. He made these remarks in no spirit of hostility to the Bill. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would live up to his former reputation, and treat this Education Bill in the same manner as he did the Licensing Bill of last year. If the right hon. Gentleman trusted the Scotch Members, and allowed them to introduce necessary Amendments, he was sure that in the end the measure would redound to the advantage of the right hon. Gentleman and the Government, and confer a boon on Scotland.

SIR MARK STEWART (Kirkcudbrightshire) thought he might congratulate his right hon. friend on the reception with which this Education Bill had been met. There had been criticism of a very important character, and some of which he hoped would be considered carefully in Committee, but it had been in no sense hostile criticism. In his opinion the Bill was a statesmanlike measure, and embodied a large amount of the opinion of Scotland. He was sure that all the Scotch Members were willing to combine and make it as perfect as possible. It must have struck Englishmen in the House how very different Scotch educational matters were treated when it was for the good of the nation than they were treated in England. He knew from long experience that when an English Education Bill was introduced, it was the signal for religious faction. They had no experience of that kind in Scotland. He was one of those who took a very strong view on the necessity of making the county the unit of area, and if that were not possible, he hoped districts would be allowed to combine. There would be a good many heart-burnings and jealousies if one area was allowed to set up a good secondary school and not another. In regard to managers, he had been very much interested in the discussion as to their powers and duties. As chairman of a very large group of schools ever since 1873, he had seen how the whole matter worked out. In his opinion unlimited power should be given to the School Boards. The more they were trusted the better the results would be. If they were fettered by the Department in London, they would be deprived of half of their usefulness. There were some questions, of course, which could not be very easily unravelled by the School Boards, and in which they must be assisted by the Department. He had always found that the Education Department were glad to listen to any reasonable suggestion he had made. He supported what had been said on the other side of the House in regard to the head of the Department. That Gentleman would be missed, and many warm friends of education would be sorry that he was leaving the high position which he had so well adorned for so many years. Apart from that, however, he could not help saying that they in Scotland had been too much under the thumb of the Education Department. As he had said already, the more the School Boards were trusted, the better the work they would do.

He did not know how School Boards in very considerable parts of the country could work large schools and supervise small details, such as repairs of buildings, without a strong committee of managers. This it would be impossible for a School Board meeting fifteen or twenty miles away to do. The committee should consist of local men who understood local wants. He trusted that the managers would be able to assist the School Boards and would give them all the assistance in their power. He thought that every School Board should have a clerk of works. Hon. Members who did not study the matter practically had no idea of the amount of work that was to be done and of the tens of thousands of pounds that had to be spent even in comparatively small parishes. There were sanitary arrangements to be seen to, as well as the general upkeep of the school, and many other matters for which a practical clerk of works would be required. He congratulated the Government on the manner in which they proposed to deal with the question of the teachers. As his hon. friend had stated, if a schoolmaster were allowed to change from one school to another he would have a better chance of promotion. It was no great inducement, however, to a teacher to be allowed to go only from one parish to another; he ought to be able to go over the entire country, and in that way the best men would have the best chance. He trusted that something would be done with reference to the training of teachers. Unless they had good teachers they might as well stop at once. The difficulty at present in getting good teachers was very great, and he saw no reason to hope that more teachers would be forthcoming unless they were given greater encouragement. No doubt more money would be spent, but as long as the teachers were brought up to the highest standard he was perfectly certain that neither the Scottish Education Department nor the Scottish Members would object. He was also glad to see that under the Bill a teacher who had been dismissed would have the right to appeal; that was a great safeguard to a man who was striving to do his best according to his lights.

As regarded the provincial councils, he thought that if a national council met at Edinburgh every year to discuss educational matters it might be very useful. With reference to the denominational schools, he did not see any great harm in the School Boards, if they saw fit, giving them assistance. He was satisfied that School Boards would take a fair and reasonable view of this question; and if Parliament would only leave them alone everything would go smoothly in the future as it had gone smoothly up to the present. There were some parishes which had done excellent work in providing schools for the last thirty years. They had spent thousands of pounds; but other parishes had done as little as they possibly could, and just scraped along. Were they to be put on exactly the same footing as the parishes which had possibly incurred a very large debt? That would not be fair, and he thought that parishes that had not their schools in order should be called upon to put them in order before they obtained any of the privileges under the Bill. He himself would rejoice if all the elections could be held on one day. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Aberdeen stated that it really did not matter, as they had not too many elections. He, however, thought there were too many elections. In the United States, at a Presidential election, all the positions from the President downwards were set out on one voting paper, all the electors voted on the same day, and there was no confusion. Why should not some such system be adopted in Scotland? The Roman Catholics were in a different position now to what they were. They had been very strong on the School Boards because of the cumulative vote; but the cumulative vote was now to be taken away, and it was therefore only fair that they should receive the grant. In conclusion, he hoped that Amendments would be favourably considered by his right hon. friend.

*MR. JOHN DEWAR (Inverness) said that it was difficult to make a speech without repeating to some extent what had been already said. He had, however, a subject which had not yet been touched upon, and to which he wished to direct the attention of the House. It was the manner in which the Bill would affect the Highlands of Scotland. Hon. Members were sometimes apt to forget that the people in the Highlands lived in practically a different world; they were a different race, spoke a different language, had a different religion, and lived under very different social conditions from those which existed in other parts of Scotland. There was also great poverty in the Highlands. The average education rate over the whole of Scotland was 11½d. in the £; but in one parish in his constituency the rate was positively 4s. and in another parish the whole of the rates amounted to 13s. 4d. in the £. There was nothing to compare with that in any other part of Scotland; and those who paid those rates got very little advantage indeed. In large town in England the rates might amount to 10s. in the £; but then tramways, electric lighting, free libraries, and other luxuries were provided; but in the Highland districts the people had no luxuries at all and very few conveniences. That had been recognised by the Government and the Department under what was known as the Highland Minute of 1895, which provided for special treatment for Highland schools. He should like to ask if that special treatment was to be continued. As regarded rating, he wished to point out how very poor the Highland districts were, and how very little was to be expected from them. In one parish the rateable value was only 8s. per head of the population, and very little could be expected from a parish like that in the way of primary education, much less technical and secondary education. He was sure the House would understand that the Highlands deserved special treatment. As regarded the class of schools, no less than 43 per cent. of the schools in the Western Highlands had less than fifty pupils. Last year he drew attention to the matter and suggested that the grant which was then about to be distributed should be given with some regard to the difficulty of obtaining teachers with any degree of efficiency for schools in the Western Highlands. That suggestion was not given effect to; but under the new Bill the schools would receive what they deserved.

With regard to the question of the areas, it was suggested that these were too small. One or two hon. Members suggested that the county would be the better area; but in regard to counties like Inverness and Argyll that plan would not work at all. It was very important to retain in the management of the schools the local element, especially that of the parents. The County Council of Inverness was an admirably managed body; but he doubted if ten members of it had children at a parish school. If the county were adopted as the area, there would not be that interest taken in the parish school which ought to be taken in it, and for that reason he supported the proposal in the Bill. As regarded management, he thought the Government had practically retained the local element which would be more interested in the success and efficiency of the school than others. He agreed that the appointment of managers should be in the hands of the School Board, not in the hands of the parish council which did not want it; but a provision ought to be introduced that a certain proportion of the managers should be the parents of the children attending the schools. In that way local interest would be maintained and stimulated. The question of the denominational schools was a matter of pressing interest in Invernesshire. There was a large body of Roman Catholics there; but the religious difficuly did not exist in any way. In the case of Barra, which had been mentioned, a large proportion of the children were Catholics; they had a Catholic School Board and Catholic teachers, and the Catholic teachers taught Protestant children everything but religion. Where there was a Protestant School Board and a Catholic school the appointment of the teachers of the Catholic school was left in the hands of the local priest and other members of the Catholic community in conference with the School Board. It was all carried on with the greatest goodwill, and no question of ill feeling arose. He thought that the proposal of the Government with reference to the denominational schools was the fairest and best that could be adopted. The local board would say whether or not a grant was to be given. He should like to ask the Secretary for Scotland what exactly was the meaning of the section which indicated that if a denominational school were refused support by the local School Board the managers might apply to the Department. Had the Department power to contribute to such schools in such cases. If it only meant that they were to be allowed the 3s. grant he had no objection.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY said that that was already done all over the country under the Minute in connection with schools with small staffs.

MR. JOHN DEWAR said he thought the method adopted by the Government in connection with the denominational schools was an admirable one. He regretted that the question of the training of teachers had not been more definitely mentioned in the Bill. With regard to the difficulty of getting teachers for the Highlands, a schoolmaster stated that of the seventy-seven adult teachers in a certain district in the Highlands, forty-seven were assistants, and of those only six were trained. One school with 130 children was being worked by a head-master and two pupil teachers. In Glasgow the proportion was one certificated teacher for every fifty-one pupils; whereas in Lewis the proportion was one certificated teacher for every 102 pupils. He thought that something should be done in the Bill whereby teachers in the Western Highlands should receive some encouragement in passing on to the training colleges. There was one other matter he would like to mention. He knew that the Department had never encouraged the teaching of Gaelic as a special subject. He thought, however, that where Gaelic was the language of a district, the teacher ought to know both languages. He came across one school in the Highlands where the teacher was a Londoner, his wife being a London lady. The teacher did not know Gaelic and when asked how the children understood him he said they just picked it up as best they could. Education could not be carried on on that principle.

With regard to provincial councils, there were two hon. Members who did not want any councils at all, and other hon. Members only wanted one council. He himself, however, was one of the first to approve of the proposal in the Bill, which he heartily welcomed. It had been suggested that a provincial council would not be able to stand up to the Education Department. He was not so sure of that; but he wanted a council in the capital of the Highlands which would be able to bring before the Department the needs and requirements of education in the Highlands. If there were only one council meeting in Edinburgh, the representation of the Highlands would suffer, and he well remembered being told by a county councillor from the Hebrides that, although his council met in Inverness, he had to give up his office because it took five days to attend each meeting and cost him as many pounds. How much greater would be the difficulty if the meetings were held in Edinburgh? He was sure they would have better results if they held the meetings at Inverness. The present Secretary for Education in Scotland and the Under-Secretary took special interest in education in the Highlands; they had visited the various districts and made themselves personally acquainted with their requirements. He was anxious, therefore, to have some guarantee that education in the Highlands should have special attention. There was a clause in the Bill which dealt with physical training, but neither physical training nor mental training was of any use unless the children were properly fed. This, too, was a subject in which the people of the Highland districts were specially interested. Their homes were widely scattered and the children had to walk long distances to school. They had to leave home early in the day and did not return till late. Some took provisions with them, but it was clear they could not carry on their studies without suitable food. He hoped that power would be given to the School Boards to contribute to a fund to provide, where it was necessary, a suitable mid-day meal for the children. He knew that in some districts schoolmasters and mistresses organised funds for the purpose of providing these meals, but it was not possible to do that in all places, and he therefore thought it would be well to give the School Board power to make necessary contributions for the purpose. Finally, he would like to point out that the effect of taking away the grant from the Government was to alter the incidence of the rates in many boroughs by putting a new rate on the occupiers and taking a rate off the owners. That was contrary to the trend of modern legislation and he thought, therefore, it was a matter which required to be looked into.

Mr. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton) said the discussion up to that point had been almost entirely concentrated upon the structure of the educational body, the area of its authority and the influence of the teachers, and not a word had been addressed to the object of the education—the child, which was to have instruction foisted upon it at great expense to the

State. No reference had been made to the Report of the Royal Commission on Physical Training, and, the Bill failing to deal with the recommendations of that body, he could not join in the general chorus of praise which had been given to the Secretary for Scotland. What were the recommendations of that body? Put briefly they were that the provision of school meals should, where it was necessary, be part of the charge incident to school management. Returns which had been obtained showed that something like 9 per cent. of the school children in Aberdeen were badly nourished, and in Edinburgh the position was still worse. The Commissioners pointed out that the housing difficulty was inseparable from the question of the condition of the children, and it was idle to spend all this public money and to squabble over school areas and the training of teachers while the bodies of the children were incapable of receiving the mental instruction which Parliament demanded should be given to them. He, for one, held that it was a matter of considerable reproach to the authors of the Bill that they were not taking at least permissive power in the measure to give school authorities throughout Scotland the necessary authority to provide the children with food. He was not relying solely on the conclusions arrived at by a Royal Commission. He had noted with pleasure that the hon. Member for the Partick Division had admitted that the physical question was one of prime importance. One hon. Member had stated that the expenditure on education would be wasted unless the children were provided with spectacles to enable them to see the black-boards. Another had suggested that members of School Boards should be paid. Let them begin at the right end and realise that children should be physically capable of receiving the education provided, and that that was as important as that they should have glasses wherewith to read the blackboard. Let them strive to ensure that the children's eyes were not dimmed by misery and hunger.

This was not a difficulty which existed merely in the East-end of London. Anyone who read the Report of the Royal Commission on Physical Training in Scotland would see that, whether in rural or in urban districts, there were vast numbers of children unfitted to receive education by reason of parental neglect—through drink and other causes—to provide them with proper food and clothing. It was a well-known fact that agricultural labourers, who were among the poorest ratepayers, had readily contributed, with teachers, to the fund for supplying children with food, and the Government should take this opportunity of following the lead given them by their own Commission and add "meals" to those permissive matters with which the local authorities would be authorised to deal. The child who was made to submit to compulsory education should certainly be physically fit to undergo the intellectual strain it was desired to subject it to in order to enable it to become a capable citizen hereafter. They could not get away from the fact—and they might call it Socialism or what they liked—that, practically, under the present system of education they had taken the child away from its parents for educational purposes. The State had assumed the guardianship for nine years of the child's life, and it was bound to see that the money thus expended on the child was not wasted as it had been in the past. In other respects the Bill, he believed, merited warm approval, and he trusted that when it had been amended in the direction he had suggested it would pass into law. Although he had spoken strongly he did not wish to deny to the right hon. Gentleman all credit for the skill, energy, and sincerity which he had devoted to the production of the measure.

MR. URE (Linlithgowshire) said it was difficult to make a Second Reading speech on a Bill with the principle of which they were all agreed, as consequently their criticisms had to be directed to details. If he could not join in the chorus of praise so cheerfully as his colleagues had done, the right hon. Gentleman would understand it was not because he grudged him and his colleagues all the honour and glory due to them as the authors of the measure, or because of the hint which had been thrown out that they found the Bill ready to their hands when they first entered upon office. His seeming stinginess of praise was due to the fact that his constituents were fairly well satisfied with the system already existing in Scotland,

and none of them who had listened to the exposition by the hon. Member for the Border Burghs of the difficulties of education in Scotland, would find it hard to understand why it was that they were so much attached to their present system. The complaints which arose when the Scottish Education Department came into direct contact with a local authority and which would not be relieved or mitigated by the Bill had not been experienced to any extent in his own constituency, where the educational machine had worked smoothly and satisfactorily for many years past, and that constituency was, after all, typical of the great bulk of Scottish counties. Comment had been made on the fact that the Bill had not received much attention at the hands of the people of Scotland, and that very few meetings had been held either to protest against its provisions or to approve of them. No one need be astonished at that. It had been cynically observed that the best system of ventilation was one entirely under the control of the inhabitants of the building, and in the same way he supposed that the best system of education was one entirely under the control of the parents. Acting on that principle, he had not dreamed for one moment of summoning a public meeting to consider the proposals of the right hon. Gentleman; he had deemed it sufficient to seek the opinion of educational experts in his constituency—the opinions of those who passed their lives in educational work, on whose shoulders would rest the responsibility of working this Bill when passed, and upon whose energy would depend the making or marring of the measure. In the few observations he had to make, therefore, he wished it to be understood that he was not merely expressing his individual opinion, but also the views of those on whom the success of the measure would ultimately depend. He represented an average Scottish constituency.

Mr. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): Not a Highland one.

Mr. URE: Well, an average Lowland constituency, and he had to say at once that those whom he had consulted accepted without comment as a matter of course the *ad hoc* principle. No other would, in fact, be suited to the peculiarities of the Scottish educational system, and it was deeply rooted in their national history. It had been tested and had worked remarkably well. They also appreciated the advantages of a wider area and a larger electorate, and, so far as secondary and technical education were concerned, of the concentration of power, means, and authority these larger boards were designed to secure. On the whole, they preferred the areas proposed by the Bill to the county areas. It was all very well for hon. Gentlemen to say that sanitation, roads, and bridges were one thing, but that education was something entirely different. Geographical considerations and considerations of the distribution of population and of the means of transit across the counties had determined the divisions of counties into districts for roads and bridges, and the same considerations were decisive in the matter of education. The people of Scotland were not blind to the advantages of the *ad hoc* area, but they were a practical people, and they saw that the ideal was not always attainable; therefore, they were prepared to lay that on one side, not because it was a bad system, but because it was unworkable under existing conditions. The proposals with regard to the powers of the new authorities were, in the main, satisfactory, but there was one that would be keenly challenged, viz., that of the delegation of duties to boards of managers. Unless that proposal were radically altered he would feel bound to vote against the Third Reading of the Bill. No self-respecting men would be found to serve on these boards of managers, because they would have, on the one hand, no honour or glory, and, on the other hand, no useful work to perform. Boards of managers were not to be allowed to raise, vote, or spend money, or to appoint, promote, or dismiss teachers; all that was to be left to them was the punishment of recalcitrant parents and the supervision of slatternly charwomen. The provision had doubtless crept in by a mistake. It was probably due to the draftsman of the English Bill, who had forgotten the radical difference between the two measures, because, while the English Act confided the administration of education to existing local bodies, the Scotch Bill dealt with bodies elected for educational purposes only. The cure was extremely simple; it was that, the School Boards having been elected, full confidence should be placed in them. It should be left to them to appoint from among themselves committees to manage the schools in the districts under their charge; their own good sense would probably lead them to appoint the members most closely connected with the districts in which the schools were situated. If the right hon. Gentleman made Clause 19 applicable to county districts as well as to the enumerated districts, and dropped Clause 20, the thing would be done.

The manner in which the Bill dealt with voluntary and denominational schools was as sagacious as it was tactful. There was no disposition whatever on the part of School Boards to refuse grants of public money to such schools as were giving efficient instruction, but they would only do so provided there was a modicum of local control. So far as he could judge from the Roman Catholics in his own constituency, that modicum of local control would not be refused, provided it was confined to secular instruction. That point was met by the Bill, because the School Boards were to be entitled, before voting money to such schools, to impose certain conditions, so that if they thought fit they would be able to prescribe the modicum of local control that was necessary. It would probably be pressed upon the Government that this difficult, delicate, and sometimes disagreeable duty ought not to be placed upon the local body. He did not think that was a sound objection. These local bodies were to have large powers, and they ought to bear the corresponding responsibilities. They were to have almost unlimited powers of administration; therefore they ought to face the responsibilities and not shirk the accompanying disagreeable duties. He hoped the Government would stand firm to their proposals on this matter.

With regard to the finance of the Bill, there were at present five distinct channels by which money raised from taxation found its way to the aid of education. Under the Bill the full flow of those five channels was to be devoted to education. With regard to four of those channels the Government would have no difficulty whatever, but the £100,000 under the Act of 1892 was a different question. Hitherto the bulk of that money had been devoted to the relief of rates, and the burghs pointed out, with a great deal of justice, that on the faith of receiving that money they had entered upon large expenditure, so that if this money were suddenly withdrawn it would mean an increase of rates to the extent of from 1½d. to 3d. in the £. That was a serious consideration, and he was prepared to back the burghs in their request that the money should be retained for the purposes to which it had hitherto been devoted. Then there was the question of rating. Not a single voice had been raised in the House or in the country in favour of the proposal to lay upon enterprising parishes the whole burden of expenditure incurred in the erection of the buildings necessary for efficient education. He thought the provision was unjust to a degree. The School Board was to take over all the assets, but not the liabilities. The enterprising parish would have to bear those liabilities unaided, while the parish which had been lax or negligent would escape. To that provision he should certainly give his uncompromising opposition. The country had received the announcement with reference to the proposed provincial councils with perfect indifference, and the reason was not far to seek. The popular view was that they would do neither good nor harm, that they were perfectly harmless and innocent. Men of distinction in the educational world would never dream of sitting upon those councils, because if their recommendations were not in harmony with the view of the Scotch Education Department the Department would give them no heed, while, if their recommendations happened to be approved by the Department, the Department, would carry them out off its own bat and would need no jogging from the councils. Consequently it was clear that these provincial councils would be futile, and would entirely fail to effect the end the Government had in view.

*Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY supposed the Minister was truly to be congratulated who had listened through a long day to speeches which their authors admitted were not Second Reading speeches, and in which he had been again and again told that there was no intention of dividing against the Bill. It was true that notice had been given of an Amendment of grave importance, but the hon. Member for Banffshire had promptly run away from his proposal and declined to move it. The hon. Member for the Border Burghs had expressed regret that the Amendment had not been moved, but he had failed to face the alternative of moving it himself. The hon. Member had also given a curious explanation of the praise which was lavished upon the Bill when first introduced. He had stated that hon. Members opposite were in a state of trembling expectancy because of the misdeeds of the Government in connection with English education, and that when it was found that the English precedent had not been followed he had burst out into a *Te Deum*, and now he seemed to regret that his praise had been so ecstatic—

> "When the devil was sick, the devil a monk would be,"
> When the devil got well, the devil a monk was he."

The hon. Member for the Border Burghs did not persevere in that attitude, but he received the Bill and its provisions in what he was glad to recognise as a most friendly spirit to all its provisions. If he had been in the mood of a captious critic, he did not think he should have had much trouble in defending the various provisions of his Bill, not by taking counsel from the other side, but by pointing out that, although all the provisions of the Bill had been criticised, the critics were not agreed, and he had as many defenders as he had opponents amongst hon. Members opposite. Therefore, he proposed to say a few words, arranging his remarks in the order of the topics with which they dealt rather than in trying to deal with the remarks of each speaker who had addressed the House.

The most important topic of all was the question of the area. The hon. Member for Banffshire, who did not move his Amendment, formulated a distant proposition which had found but few supporters, but it deserved to be dealt with because it was distinct. He said that inasmuch as the Government had resolved on an *an hoc* authority, the proper corollary would be the selection of an *ad hoc* district. That proposition seemed to him to be fraught with difficulty, and, moreover, it was impracticable. No one who had anything to do with administration from a practical point of view could fail to agree that the overlapping of administrative areas was an unmixed evil. During the past twelve or fourteen years they had been doing their best, and with success, to get rid of the overlapping areas which existed. To disregard existing territorial divisions and to take an arbitrary line, and carve out a new administrative area, would be, in his judgment, a very grave administrative defect. If they were to draw that line, as in a case like Galashiels, they would have certain outlying portions for which, in respect to secondary education, there would be no provision made. They would, in fact, require to have a sort of boundary commission. He thought this was enough to enable them to dismiss the fantastic idea of *ad hoc* areas. He would now pass to the existing areas. The hon. Member who opened the debate appeared to quite forget the leading principle of this Bill, which so far as he knew had not got a single dissentient voice raised against it in the House, and that principle was that there should be one authority for both primary and secondary education. The hon. Member for Banffshire mentioned some idea of an aggregation of parishes for primary education for one parish, and then a still further aggregation for secondary education. There at once they had two authorities instead of one. He liked but little the suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Aberdeen, whose contribution to this point was that there should be an aggregation of parishes for the purposes of primary education and then a secondary body, elected by the body dealing with primary education from their own number. That, of course, at once introduced the whole machinery of a secondary election and at once they had not that direct trust in the people which everyone seemed to think peculiarly appropriate to Scotch ideas and methods. Under that system a person in a rural parish forming an electoral district might be sure of sending a representative whom he trusted to the first School Board, but he would have no security whatsoever that that representative would ever have anything to do with the question of secondary education, because when it came to this secondary election, formed out of the various School Boards and the different parishes, there would be no security that that particular representative would ever be so elected. He held that this left the idea of the Bill as to areas unassailed.

He did not think he was wrong in saying that general opinion was that the county was too large for primary education, therefore, of course, the system of districts taken in the Bill was a compromise. It was, indeed, a subject on which they must have a compromise. These districts had been taken as a compromise. They were formed originally for geographical considerations and consideration of access, and there was no reason why they should not be as useful for educational administration as for road and public health administration. To fix boundaries of any kind must always give rise to some difficulties and anomalies. One gentleman wrote to him stating that his house was built over a stream and that stream constituted the boundary between two districts, and he wished to know which district he was going to be in. He was afraid that no amount of ingenuity in the Bill would ever get over such difficulties as that. There seemed to be a radical misconception prevalent of the functions of the district authorities as to secondary education. It was supposed that each district must of necessity be self-supporting; but there was no such requirement in the Bill; and in practice the case would often be otherwise. Each authority must see that proper provision for secondary education was made; but there was nothing to prevent an authority from making arrangements for the children under its care to go to a school in the district of another authority. Therefore all those illustrations which the hon. Member for Renfrewshire had given which arose in consequence of the delimitations of the two districts were really not to the point. But although he had defended the district, he thought with some success, because the difficulty in the parish and the county was so much greater than in the district, he did not take a rigid line in this matter, and he was perfectly willing to consider with a favourable mind the insertion of such provisions as would make combination possible where local opinion thought that combination was necessary. He thought that was obviously a very much better plan than beginning at the other end, because they were bound to take the view that the length and breadth of Scotland would act well in this matter. Taking the district in the Bill as it stood, they had been able to create areas of manageable size. That was saying a great deal as to the workableness of the proposal, and the only exception was the case mentioned by the hon. Member for Renfrewshire, which he was quite satisfied would require exceptional treatment, and that was due to the incorporation in Renfrewshire of two large boroughs.

On the question of management, again, he thought several speakers had laboured under a misconception. The object of the management clauses was one in which he believed every one would concur. It was to retain local interest in the school. But his mind was more than open upon the point, and he was perfectly willing to give way to the general opinion of Scotland in the matter. He only wished to find out what the general opinion of Scotland was, and to that general opinion he was perfectly prepared to give way. He was perfectly willing to alter the proportion. If he gathered that it was really the feeling of the Scottish representatives that they would sooner the whole matter was left in the hands of the elected School Board, he was quite prepared to trust the School Boards to see that there was proper local management.

With regard to the financial portion of the Bill, three topics had been dealt with which were perfectly distinct. There was one topic which, as a matter of fact, was only dealt with by the hon. Member for Renfrewshire, but it was nevertheless an exceedingly important one, and a great deal of what the hon. Member had said was perfectly true. His point was that it would be very much better not to keep the old parochial rating, as they were no longer having the parochial area, and his great point was that if they gave up parochial rating they would have to give up that inequality which resulted from the system of classification and the system of deductions. If he had more time he might explain these points, but hon. Members might take it from him that as a matter of fact it was in the power of one parochial Board to make the valuation on which the rating was actually calculated very different to the principle on which another Board might act. He was bound to say he thought there was a good deal in that. The reason why he put the provision as it stood in the Bill was that he thought he knew what the opinion was. He thought the line of least resistance was to keep the School Board rate as it always had been. The school rate had been collected along with the poor rate, and therefore the poor rate was allowed to remain, but his hon. friend the Member for Renfrewshire and others came to him and argued that it would be better to secure actual equity by taking the rates on the gross valuation. Here, again, he had no desire to stick to the Bill rigidly, and he was ready to substitute the county for the local rate. As to the subject of the old debt, it was obviously a case in which they wanted to do what was most truly equitable, and he would be willing to find a solution of the problem in the direction which the Committee considered most likely to lead to that equity. But do not let anybody run away with the idea that the equities were all on the one side. It was not at all a one-sided matter, and when the proper time came he thought he would be able to show ample justification for the proposition in the Bill.

He passed now to the very much more important question of the general finance of the Bill, and especially to what he might call "the pooling clause." He asked hon. Members to remember the state of things which he found and with which he had to deal. He thought it was the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Aberdeen who paid him the compliment that he was the only Member in the House who, without the books, could have told the sources from which the money came. He believed it was not an undeserved compliment. He did not suppose anyone could pass an examination on that subject except the hon. Member for Mid Lanark. He could assure the hon. Member that it was a great pleasure to him to be a yoke-fellow with him in any contest of that kind. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Aberdeen was entirely in favour of the pooling clause. He did not think anybody was against it. But a great deal of the criticism had been as to the way the money was to be paid out. It was said, "Oh! you are putting the whole thing into the hands of the Department." The right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Aberdeen made a suggestion which was really not practical, and it was one which he did not believe he would regard as practical when he came to think over it. The right hon. Gentleman had suggested that some of the money should still be allowed to go to the local authorities to be appropriated as they thought fit to purposes other than education. It would be an expedient that for one thing would do away with the pooling, of which the right hon. Gentleman approved. The hon. Member for North West Lanark also made a serious mistake as to the amount of money which had been for the first time put under the command of the Department which was not under it before. The hon. Gentleman forgot entirely that a very large amount of this money was the aid grant which was the equivalent for the money provided under the English Bill—money in respect of which the claims, he humbly thought, of the voluntary schools, especially the Roman Catholic schools, had not been absolutely understood. It was money which never passed under any local control at all. It was Imperial funds given to any local source of education which was doing the educational work of the country. He wished that time permitted to develop this subject further, but of course he would have an opportunity of doing it afterwards. All he could say was that he was prepared to maintain that, so far as the sum of £220,000 was concerned, it would be absolutely inequitable not to give it to the voluntary schools, and specially to the Roman Catholics, who from their numbers were entitled to the largest share.

He asked hon. Members to look at the clause for a moment and to say how they could oust the Department. There were, in the first place, to be inspections and leaving certificates. Who could do that work except a central department? Obviously no one. Secondly, there was the establishment of a central fund to give grants in aid, and that must be under the guidance of a central department. When they passed from that what else did they get. Money was to be given in aid of such educational institutions as might be expressly recognised by the Department under any Code or Minute for the purpose of the sub-section. That dealt with money either for problematical training colleges, or other central educational institutions which were doing special work in the country, and which were not necessarily under the control of the School Board at all. It was further provided that money might be given in aid of the provision of higher education whether the schools were available for Parliamentary grants or not. He asked the House to observe that all this could not be done in any favouring way. It must be done under the general rules which the Department put in the Code for the ordinary Government grants given for primary education. Money might also be given in aid of expenditure for bursaries. Then there was provision for payments in lieu of the old necessitous School Board divisions—the payment of 1½d. for each complete 2d. That was really a contribution to the poor neighbourhoods in respect of the £60,000 which was got. In regard to the particular Highland clause for dealing with cases where the rating was very high, it was obvious that the aid must be given by a central authority. But hon. Members had entirely forgotten as to the balance clause which, according to their calculation, gave at least a third of the whole fund to the local authorities. That money was neither spent nor controlled by the Department, it was given in hard cash to the School Boards and managers of voluntary schools, to spend as they pleased in their own control of education. Not a single speaker as far as he could tell from his utterances seemed alive to that very obvious fact which really destroyed the cogency of much of the criticism passed upon it. After all, there had been too much said about the Department. He must honestly say that the way in which hon. Members spoke of the Department puzzled him. They first of all indulged in praises which he would not call extravagant, but which were deserved of the very eminent gentleman who for so many years was the permanent head of the Department. He was always glad to hear those praises because he knew how well deserved they were. Having said he was the most efficient servant the Department ever had, hon. Members turned round and said the one terrible thing had been the predominance of the Department and the effect which it had had on the development of Scotch education. He did not know where he was when he heard the hon. Member for the Border Burghs paying a sort of panegyric when he spoke of the educational progress of Scotland, and then heard the hon. Baronet the Member for West Renfrew speak of the Department laying its chilling hand on the cause of education in Scotland. Surely they could not both be true.

A great many hon. Members entirely forgot what the Department was, and why it should be there. Not a single hon. Member had referred to the fact that a great deal more money was spent in education than this sum of £600,000; some £1,500,000 or £1,600,000 was spent on education which came from the Imperial Exchequer and was distributed through the Department. The Department was the only buffer between the Imperial Exchequer and the spending authorities; how, then, could it be dispensed with? From some of the criticisms one would suppose that they could get on without any Department at all. Some of the gentlemen who wrote articles in the newspapers seemed to have no idea of what was meant by administrative control. He noticed an article written by a Mr. Leishman in one of the Edinburgh papers indicated that the idea of the Department having anything to do with the Treasury had practically no point at all, and that the whole idea was the convenience of the Secretary for Scotland. Well, the convenience of the Secretary for Scotland was neither here nor there, but for administrative reasons it was essential that the Scotch Education Department should be near the Treasury. As long as he had anything to do with the Department, he would absolutely resist to the utmost any proposal to take away the Department from actual touch with its political head, a contact whose influence for better control and the avoidance of friction could only be known to those who had practical experience of administrative working. But the Department had something else to do than with the Treasury. Did not hon. Members reflect that if local bodies were allowed of their own sweet will to modify the Code as they chose, they could practically cost the nation any sum they liked for education? Did they not reflect that every alteration made in the Code had to be a matter of expert consideration between the Department and the Treasury to find out practically how much the alteration would cost. Unless that were done they could not possibly have equality of treatment in the different portions of the United Kingdom. Some forward local body would soon write out a Code which would enable a Scottish child to earn three times as much as an English child could, and therefore that would be impossible from a Treasury point of view. It showed how extraordinarily little gentlemen who wrote letters of that sort knew of the practical work of an administrative Department.

On the question of control it was often impossible, from the very nature of things, that they could have two really controlling bodies, but he was not insensible of the desire that there should be greater contact between the Department and Scottish opinion. The provincial councils were meant to be consultative and not administrative; and that being so he thought there was much in favour of keeping them as they were in the Bill and not amalgamating them into one larger and much more unwieldy council which would not know so much of the local needs. He was only too glad to accede to the suggestion that the Bill should not be treated by him in any controversial spirit. He hoped he had shown by what he had said that he accepted the suggestion in the friendly spirit in which it was given. In all minor matters he was quite willing to listen to any suggestions quite irrespective of the side of the House from which they came. All he was greatly concerned to keep was the cardinal feature of the Bill, namely, the maintenance of one authority for primary and secondary education. He was equally interested in maintaining for Roman Catholics and Episcopalians what he considered was their proportion of the finances to which they were entitled. He believed that the clause to which so much criticism had been directed — the pooling clause — when further examined would be found as regarded the primary provisions of the Bill to be a practical expedient. He hoped the House would now grant the Second Reading of the Bill.

Mr. WEIR moved the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY said he could not accept that proposition.

Mr. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs) said he was surprised that the right hon. Gentleman wished to take the Second Reading now. He must be aware that there were fifteen Gentlemen who desired to state their views in regard to the local situation in their constituencies.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Weir*)

Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The House divided:—Ayes, 128; Noes, 72. (Division List No. 102.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds)
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bignold, Arthur
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A. (Worc.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, William Bromley
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dimsdale, Rt. Hon. Sir Joseph C.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Laurence, Sir Edwin
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne

Fison, Frederick William
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S.W.)
Fyler, John Arthur
Galloway, William Johnson
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Gore, Hn. G. R. C. Ormsby-(Salop
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.)
Gretton, John
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'd'nderry
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th)
Heath, James (Staffords. N. W.
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hunt, Rowland
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks. N. R
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S)
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W.
Malcolm, Ian
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell, W. J. H (Dumfriesshire
Montagu, G. (Huntington)
Morgan, David J. (Walhamstow)
Morrell, George Herbert
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. Grahan (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Randles, John S.
Rasch, Sir Frederick Carne
Reid, James (Greenock)
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset)
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tufnell, Lieut. Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wylie, Alexander

Tellers for the Ayes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Ainsworth, John Stirling
Asher, Alexander
Asquith, Rt. Hon Herbert Henry
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Caldwell, James
Cawley, Frederick
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Crean, Eugene
Crombie, John William
Cullinan J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Devlin, Charles Ramsay (Galway
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Ellice, Capt E C (S Andrew's Bghs
Farrell, James Patrick
Ffrench, Peter
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard R.
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hayden, John Patrick
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Joyce, Michael
Kilbride, Denis
Labouchere, Henry
Levy, Maurice
Lundon, W.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeah, Jeremiah
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
Moss, Samuel
Murphy, John
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Malley, William
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Roche, John
Seely, Maj. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Shackleton, David James
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr)
Ure, Alexander
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley J. H. (Halifax)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. Causton.

Question put accordingly, "That the Debate be now adjourned."

The House divided: — Ayes, 70; Noes, 127. (Division List No. 103.)

AYES.

Ainsworth, John Stirling
Asher, Alexander
Asquith, Rt Hon. Herbert Henry
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Caldwell, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Crean, Eugene
Crombie, John William
Cullinan, J.
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)

Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Ellice, Capt E. C(S. Andrw's Bghs
Farrell, James Patrick
Ffrench, Peter
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hayden, John Patrick
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Joyce, Michael
Kilbride, Denis
Levy, Maurice
Lundon, W.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeah, Jeremiah
M'Hugh Patrick A.
Moss, Samuel
Murphy, John
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Malley, William
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Roche, John
Shackleton, David James
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr)
Ure, Alexander
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Buchanan and Mr. Dalziel.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner James Tynte
Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt. Hn Gerald W. Leeds)
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bignold, Arthur
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A. (Worc.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, William Bromley
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dimsdale, Rt. Hon. Sir Joseph C.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Duke Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fison, Frederick William
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W.
Fyler, John Arthur
Galloway, William Johnson
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Gore, Hn G. R. C. Ormsby-(Salop
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs)
Gretton, John
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'derry
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th
Heath, James (Staffords. N. W)
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.)
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hunt, Rowland
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks, N. R
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.)
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W.
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell, W. J. H (Dumfriesshire
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Morgan, David J (Walthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt. Hn A. Graham (Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Randles, John S.
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Reid, James (Greenock)
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rothschild, Hon Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset)
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Rt Hon. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Whitely, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wylie, Alexander

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY claimed, "That the original Question be now put."

Original Question, "That the Bill be now read a second time," put accordingly, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed for to-morrow.

Adjourned at twenty-two minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Tuesday, 3rd May, 1904.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The Lord Chancellor aquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with:—Mullingar, Kells, and Drogheda Railway.

And also the Certificates that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with:—Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 2) [H.L.]; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3) [H.L.].

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

De Trafford Estate Bill [H.L.]. Judge's Report received; Bill presented, and read 1^a.

Llanelly Harbour Bill [H.L.]. The King's consent signified; and Bill reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

Marylebone Chapels (St. James, Westmoreland Street) Bill [H.L.]; Blyth and Cowpen Gas Bill; Kirkby-in-Ashfield Urban District Gas Bill; Minehead Urban District Council Water Bill [H.L.]; Kettering Improvement Bill. Reported, with Amendments.

Sutton Gas Bill; Bishop's Stortford and District Gas Bill. Reported, without Amendment.

St. Mary Woolnoth Bill [H.L.]. Report from the Select Committee, That the Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the Bill, the opposition thereto having been withdrawn; read, and ordered to lie on the Table. The orders made on the 4th of March and the 22nd of April last discharged, and Bill committed.

Amersham, Beaconsfield, and District Water Bill. Read 2^a, and committed.

Chesterfield Gas and Water Board Bill [H.L.]; Harrogate Waterworks Tramroad Bill [H.L.]; Leeds Corporation (Waterworks) Railway Bill [H.L.]; Neath, Pontardawe, and Brynaman Railway Bill [H.L.]. Read 3^a, and passed, and sent to the Commons.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill. Brought from the Commons; read 1^a; to be printed; and referred to the Examiners. (No. 69.)

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [H.L.] (No. 67). A Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Tramways Act, 1870, relating to Bishop Auckland, Shildon, and Spennymoor Tramways, Dewsbury Corporation Tramways, East Ham Urban District Council Tramways, Ossett Corporation Tramways, Sunderland Corporation Tramway, and West Ham Corporation Tramways. And

Canal Rates and Charges (Regents Canal) Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.] (No. 68). A Bill to confirm a Provisional Order made by the Board of Trade under the Railway and Canal Traffic Act, 1888, containing the schedule of maximum rates and charges applicable to the Regents Canal.

Were presented by the Lord Wolverton; read 1^a; to be printed; and referred to the Examiners.

Barry Railway (Extension of Time, etc.) Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to.

Private Legislation Procedure (Wales) Bill. Message from the Commons for leave for the Lord Balfour to attend to be examined as a witness before the Select Committee of that House. Leave given for his Lordship to attend if he think fit; and his Lordship (in his place) consenting thereto, a Message ordered to be sent to the Commons to acquaint them therewith.

St. Bartholomew's Hospital Bill [H.L.]. The Lord Bishop of London (in his place) consented to the Bill.

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1.) Bill [H.L.] (No. 66). A Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Tramways Act, 1870, relating to Altrincham Urban District Council Tramways. Calverley

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member

Urban District Council Tramways, Crompton Urban District Council Tramways, Plymouth Corporation Tramways, Rochdale Corporation Tramway, Royton Urban District Council Tramways, and Wardle Urban District Council Tramway.

Educational Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill [H.L.]. Read 2ª (according to order).

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS (MISCELLANEOUS SERIES).

No. 608. Germany (Special schools for Ship Engineers).

AFRICA, No. 5 (1904).

Agricultural Report on the district between Voi and Kiu, in the East Africa Protectorate, by Mr. A. Linton, Director of Agriculture, East Africa Protectorate; and return of game shot in the Protectorate during 1903.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

IRISH LAND COMMISSION (RULES).

Rules made in pursuance of Section 88, Sub-section 5, of the Irish Land Act, 1903, dated 23rd April, 1904. Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

STREET BETTING BILL [H.L.].

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

*LORD DAVEY: My Lords, this Bill which I propose to ask your Lordships to read a second time is the Bill of last year with the omission of those provisions which, I think, led to its rejection. I understand that the noble Earl who moved the rejection of the Bill last year will not now oppose it in its present form. The Bill as it now comes before your Lordships is in substance a Bill for the better suppression of street betting, and there are two additions, to which I will draw particular attention when I refer to the Bill itself. I repeat that the substance of the measure is the suppression of street betting. and if your Lordships approve of that object I hope you will read the Bill a second time.

I think it is unnecessary for me to take up any great portion of your Lordships' time in referring either to the great prevalence of street betting or to the inadequacy of the present law to meet that evil. I would remind your Lordships that your Select Committee on Betting in the year 1902 said—

> "When a street bookmaker is convicted twenty-five times in four years and is able to pay £137 odd in fines and costs—to take a typical example of many cases that have been brought to the notice of the Committee—it is obvious that the profits of his calling are very great, and that the penalties provided by the law are not sufficiently strong."

I would also remind your Lordships that one of the greatest evils attaching to this form of street betting is the way in which women and children are encouraged to bet. There was evidence before the Select Committee of children of tender years being seen going to a member of this fraternity and offering their coppers, and we had also evidence by police superintendents of the way in which the betting fraternity haunt corners of streets and solicit workmen coming and returning from their work, and, when the workmen are at work, solicit their wives at their house doors. I will not allude further to the evils which this Bill is intended to meet, but I may mention that since the subject was before your Lordships last year I have had a number of communications upon it. I received a letter from the Lord Mayor of Manchester, enclosing a report of a meeting held for the City and the borough of Salford, at which he presided, and at which a resolution was passed strongly urging the Watch Committee to formulate by-laws and take any other measures which were practicable for effectually dealing with the great and alarming increase of street betting, for diminishing inducements to bet, and forbidding the sale of tips or printed matter referring to betting. I also received a communication from the same source approving of the Bill which was before your Lordships' House last year. I have in my hand a letter from the Association of Municipal Corporations, in which they state that this subject has on several occasions occupied the attention of that association, and that at the last meeting of the council a resolution was passed asking the Government to secure the passing of an Act providing that bookmakers should be liable to more severe penalties.

Now, as to the inadequacy of the present penalties, your Lordships are aware that street betting is now dealt with only under by-laws for the purpose of preventing obstruction in the streets. Difficulty is found in enforcing those by-laws, and the penalties which can be imposed under them are wholly inadequate to meet the evil. As was stated in the evidence given before the Committee, bookmakers laugh at the penalty. One man, it was stated, offered an additional £5 to the poor-box, and, generally, they pay the fine and go on their way rejoicing. Since the Bill was before your Lordships last year several cases have occurred in which magistrates, not only in London, but in Glasgow, Newcastle, Manchester, and other great cities in the Kingdom, have expressed their regret that they could not impose larger penalties for this class of offence. Alderman Sir David Evans, speaking in the city of London, said that betting in the streets attracted clerks and office boys who had charge of petty cash and stamps, and very often their lives were blighted as a consequence of the temptation to which they were subjected. He (Sir David Evans) hoped that the law would be amended, as the present fines were quite insufficient. The present Lord Mayor of London expressed a similar opinion as to the inadequacy of the fines, and went on to say that he had made personal representations to the Home Secretary, but was sorry to receive a reply to the effect that the Government had not time to legislate on the subject this session. I have in my hand extracts from reports of what was said by the chairman of the Salford Bench and others. Indeed, my Lords, it would be almost impossible to take up a newspaper without seeing some remarks of a similar character made by magistrates in some part of the country.

The Bill which I present to your Lordships to-night has been carefully framed so as to make it clear that it applies only to those who ply the trade and business of betting; there is no fear that two men betting with each other in the street will be brought in. The Bill only applies to the fraternity who make a trade and business of this class of betting. The penalties are increased for the first offence to a fine not exceeding £10, and for the second offence to a fine not exceeding £20, and for any subsequent offence, if convicted on indictment, to a fine not exceeding £50 or to imprisonment, with or without hard labour for a term not exceeding six months, without the option of a fine; and, if convicted on a summary conviction, to a fine not exceeding £30 or to imprisonment, with or without hard labour, for a term not exceeding three months without the option of a fine. These are the penalties which were recommended by the Select Committee, and they were first suggested by a very experienced police magistrate who is now deceased—Sir Franklin Lushington. There is a proviso at the end of the first clause dealing with the case of children under the age of sixteen years. It enacts that if a person be convicted under this section of betting with any person under the age of sixteen years, or receiving money from, or paying money to, any such person, or inciting any such person to bet with him, he shall be liable for the first and every subsequent offence to the maximum penalty or imprisonment imposed for the third and subsequent offences. That also is in accordance with the recommendations of the Select Committee.

Now, my Lords, I have to draw your attention to an addition to betting in the streets, which was also in the Bill of last year. The words are, "in any street, public park, or garden, or any place to which the public have unrestricted access." The following words are now added, "or any house licensed for the sale of intoxicating liquors." In other words, betting in a public-house is put on the same footing as betting in the streets. The reason for that is this. Prior to the decision of your Lordships' House in the Kempton Park case there had been numerous convictions, under the Betting House Act, of persons who had been found betting in public-houses; but there was evidence before the Select Committee that since the Kempton Park case it had been found impossible to obtain those convictions. The construction of the Act which was laid down in that case, and which must, of course, be taken in all Courts as the true construction of the Act, was that a person could not be convicted under that Act unless he was in some sense an occupier of the place in which he was betting. Public-house cases were numerous before that decision, but the only public-house case subsequent to it that I am aware of was a case in which a bookmaker had been allowed to occupy a particular chair or seat in the bar by the publican for the purpose of carrying on his trade. The ordinary case of a bookmaker plying his trade in a public-house has not been dealt with. I quite agree that this is a matter for consideration. I agree that it goes beyond what I have called the substance of the Bill, the object of which is to deal with street betting as a nuisance. If your Lordships think that the words "or any house licensed for the sale of intoxicating liquors" should not remain in the Bill, I shall be quite ready, if it is read a second time, to consider any Amendment to delete them when the Bill reaches the Committee stage. It is entirely for your Lordships to decide whether the Bill should be extended in that manner or not. It will not touch the substance of the Bill.

The other point to which I ought to call your Lordships' particular attention also arises in consequence of the decision in the Kempton Park case. Clause 2 of the Bill enables proprietors of grounds in which sports are carried on to exhibit at the entrance, or in some conspicuous place within the area, notices that betting is prohibited in the area or some part thereof, and if such notices are given the area is made a public place for the purpose of this Act. Before the Kempton Park decision there were numerous cases in which members of the betting fraternity who had been found betting on ordinary athletic grounds were convicted under the Betting House Act, but the Committee were informed by experienced superintendents of police who were good enough to give evidence before them that since the Kempton Park case it had been found impossible for a policeman to interfere, and the consequence was that the betting fraternity were able to ply their trade and business at pleasure on grounds used for athletic sports. I quite agree that this clause is a double-edged clause. I wish to be perfectly candid with the House, and I say at once that I think there is a good deal to be said for it and a good deal to be said against it. I think that in principle if you prohibit betting in the streets you ought to go on and treat in the same category any other similar public place; but, on the other hand, one cannot but feel this, that if you enable the proprietor or manager of an athletic ground to prohibit betting in the area, or the greater part of it, he may confine the betting within what is called the ring, and the effect may be to give a monopoly of betting to those within the ring.

This clause, for instance, would, I think, apply to a racecourse unless words were put in exempting racecourses, and the effect in the case of a racecourse would be, if this clause stood, that there would be no betting outside the ring set apart and appropriated for that purpose. That might, I think, be described as legislating differently for those who are comparatively well-to-do and those who are less well-to-do. The clause is open to that objection. On the other hand, there is an advantage, I think, in having betting on athletic grounds and racecourses localised, so as to bring it more under control. This clause was recommended, I think, unanimously by the Select Committee, and it was very largely pressed upon the attention of the Committee by magistrates and superintendents of police; but it does not, in my opinion, go to the substance of this Bill; and again I say that it is entirely a matter for the consideration of your Lordships. If an Amendment is put down for the omission of this clause it will, I am sure, receive fair consideration at your Lordships' hands, and if the Amendment be carried I do not think it will affect what I call the substance of the Bill.

I do not think it necessary to say more. The Bill contains provisions making the person offending under the Act liable to be arrested and searched, thereby putting him in the same position as a person offending under the Vagrant Act, 1867, by betting or wagering in the streets by means of an instrument. To make the Bill efficient I think some provision to that effect is necessary. I am encouraged to hope that the Bill will find acceptance at the hands of His Majesty's Government. An answer was given by the Prime Minister to a friend of mine in the other House, Mr. Channing, which leads me to hope that the Bill may be supported by the Government, subject, of course, to any Amendments which they may think it necessary to suggest. I may add that I should be very glad if the experienced draughtsman who advises the Government can improve the drafting of the Bill so as to make it most efficient for the purposes for which it is intended. I beg to move that the Bill be read a second time.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a."—(*Lord Davey.*)

Lord BELPER: My Lords, I think it would be convenient that I should express the view of His Majesty's Governnow before the debate proceeds further. The House will have gathered from the remarks which have been made by the noble and learned Lord who has just sat down that his main object in introducing this Bill is to make more stringent regulations with regard to street betting. I may say at once that the Home Office have had a mass of communications with regard to the inefficacy of the present law. As has been pointed out by the Committee of your Lordships' House which sat upon this matter and by the noble and learned Lord to-night. the regulations which can be made under by-law, are not effective because the bookmaker makes such a good thing out of his calling that he is perfectly prepared to pay over and over again the fines which can be imposed under those by-laws. Very great interest has been taken in this question by local authorities, and a large number of them have within the last few years adopted by-laws on the subject, but they have found that those by-laws are not effective. Several of the local authorities have, therefore, obtained powers in local Bills to strengthen the law, and a great number of local authorities have asked for an amendment of the general law, which would provide some such penalties as are placed in the Bill now before the House, for the purpose of putting down this serious nuisance in the public thoroughfares throughout the country. Let me only say, on that point, that I think it will be the general feeling of the House that the time has come when some step should be taken to deal with this evil in a more effective way than it is dealt with at present. It may possibly be found, however, that the wording of the local Acts which have been approved by the Home Secretary and adopted in several places, is more effective and satisfactory than the wording in the noble and learned Lord's Bill. I only mention that as the noble and learned Lord himself referred to the drafting of his Bill in the course of his observation, and I may have to move some substitution with regard to the wording at a later stage.

Although this is called a Street Betting Bill it does go considerably further in two directions, which the noble and learned Lord has himself pointed out. In the first clause licensed houses are placed in the same category with regard to betting as streets and other public-places. I will not follow the noble and learned Lord into the legal argument as to the necessity of further regulations with regard to betting in public-houses, but I should like to point out that the two matters dealt with by the Bill in addition to street betting—I refer to licensed premises and athletic grounds—stand in a very different position from street betting. They are, more or less, private places, and I think it is a matter for consideration whether the same stringent law which is necessary in public places is equally necessary in regard to public-houses and athletic grounds. I should like to make it clear, in giving the assent of His Majesty's Government to the Second Reading, that it is very probable the Government will feel it necessary to move Amendments in Committee which will confine the Bill to its main object—the prevention of street betting.

The Lord ARCHBISHOP of CANTERBURY: My Lords, I should like in a very few words to express the satisfaction with which many Members of your

Lordships' House, and notably those who sit on the Episcopal Benches, have heard that His Majesty's Government are prepared to accept the principle, at all events, which is embodied in the noble and learned Lord's Bill. After the clear and fair-minded speech which the noble and learned Lord made in introducing the Bill, it is not necessary that I, or any Member of your Lordships' House, should reiterate the reasons for which we think a Bill of this kind to be now necessary. About the magnitude of the evil there is, I imagine, no doubt or question. Of course there may be evils in existence, even of considerable magnitude, which we must deal with by other means than legislation. But this is not merely a matter in which the magnitude of the evil is evident; it is an evil the gravity of which is constantly increasing. It is when an evil is seen to be of a definitely increasing kind, and, therefore, to be, apparently, not adequately coped with by the ordinary forces for the improvement and maintenance of a moral standard, that we have a right to come to the Legislature and ask for such help as the Legislature alone can give.

The noble and learned Lord, in introducing the Bill, did not trouble the House with any statistics upon the subject, and I am not going to do so now beyond a single sentence. I find, from the information supplied to me, that the statistics are somewhat important as showing the rapidity with which this evil is increasing. Of course actual convictions for crime, or fraud, or offences of some kind or other directly attributable to betting are very inadequate as measuring the extent and increase of the evil; but still it is noteworthy that while the evidence before the Royal Commission showed that in the five years which preceded the sitting of that Commission—namely, the five years up to May, 1901—there were 320 convictions for embezzlement directly attributable to betting, in the three years that have passed since then there have been no less than 244 such convictions, showing a very rapid increase. It is not, of course, on statistics of that kind that any of us would mainly rely as supporting the statement that the evil is on the increase. The testimony of everyone who has an opportunity of observing the habits of those for whose benefit and protection this legislation is being attempted is universal, whether we take the magistracy, the police, or ordinary observers. Among ordinary observers I should put in the forefront the clergy and ministers of religion, who have special cause for trying to find out what has led to the wrongdoing which they see to be prevalent; and there is absolutely no variation in the testimony given by those who are thus responsible as to the evil being a steadily increasing one.

This Bill, even in its more limited application after it has been amended in the manner foreshadowed by the noble Lord who spoke on behalf of His Majesty's Government, will meet exactly the cases in which, so far as we can judge, the evil is at its worst. Anyone who will watch in the vicinity of newspaper offices when the evening papers are coming out, or at the gateways of great factories and public workshops, for women as well as men, will have abundant means of satisfying himself as to whether or not the evil is great now, and a very little inquiry will show him, if he is not already aware of the fact, that the evil is much greater than it was a few years ago. It is in those circumstances that your Lordships are asked to give a Second Reading to this Bill, and I desire to express my thankfulness at hearing that the Government propose to take the matter up, and endeavour to bring into effect proposals which have so long been under consideration, and which have now been brought before the House in so coherent a form by the noble and learned Lord in charge of the Bill.

Lord NEWTON: My Lords, like the noble and learned Lord who moved the Second Reading of this Bill, I was a member of the Betting Committee. I signed the Report, and I am not going to offer any opposition to the Second Reading of this Bill. But as an instance of the length to which, if this Bill were passed in its present form, things would be carried, I would direct attention to the words in the first clause—

> "Any place to which the public have unrestricted access."

If I am not mistaken, the public has unrestricted access to Epsom Downs and Newmarket Heath, and, unless the words which I have read are omitted, I presume it would be impossible to bet at those places. I merely rise for the purpose of suggesting to the noble and learned Lord that unless the progress of the Bill is to be seriously imperilled these words, at all events, should be omitted.

THE EARL OF ABERDEEN: My Lords, I think the noble Lord who has just spoken may be reassured as to the extent to which the prohibition provided for in the first clause will be carried, for this reason, that the application, as I understand it, is to professional bookmakers and not to ordinary individuals who wish to bet with one another. I confess there may be some difficulty in defining a professional bookmaker or a betting man, but perhaps some noble Lords who are better versed in practices connected with the turf than I am will enlighten us on that point. I do not think it can be said of this Bill, as it was said of the Bill which the noble and learned Lord introduced last session, that some of its provisions would be unworkable. As we have been already reminded, it is the present law which is unworkable, which is at least ineffective to a large extent in consequence of the inadequacy of the penalties imposed under it. Now that the noble Lord who represents the Home Office has stated that the Government will not oppose the Second Reading of this Bill, there is, of course, much less reason for argument in support of it than would otherwise have been the case. I am not sure, however, whether we are to infer from what the noble Lord said that the Government will undertake to give facilities for the passage of the Bill when it reaches the House of Commons. The noble Lord shakes his head.

LORD BELPER: I did not make any statement of that kind because I should not have been warranted in doing so.

THE EARL OF ABERDEEN: I noticed that the noble Lord was careful not to make any such promise, but, nevertheless, I venture to hope that when the Bill passes this House, as evidently it will, the Government will give facilities for its becoming law this session. If I may venture to say so, I think they will find the Bill a good deal more popular than some of the other measures introduced under their auspices. Many of your Lordships will recollect that about twenty years ago a Bill was introduced into this House dealing with some very delicate and difficult questions in regard to the social life of the country. That Bill, after a good deal of discussion, was passed, and I remember some noble friends of mine stating that it was all very well for us to pass it here, but that in the House of Commons it would have a very poor chance. I ventured to predict that it would have as good a reception there as it had met with in this House. What happened? The Bill was, as a matter of fact, strengthened in the House of Commons. There was a very strong public feeling on that question, and I venture to think that in this case also there is a very strong feeling, far more widespread than is imagined, in support of legislation of this character. Therefore, I feel convinced that if the Government do extend their ægis to this Bill in the other House their action will be fully endorsed. I had hoped to see in the House to-night more noble Lords who are known to take an interest in racing matters, and that some of them would have spoken in favour of this Bill. There are outside a numerous class who imagine that if they have a bet they are in some sense sportsmen. Many a young man fancies that he stands some inches higher in the estimation of his friends if he can claim that he has some money on a horse. Those who happen to bet themselves may have scruples in condemning it in others, but the evil is not so great where the practice is indulged in with safety and prudence. I think if noble Lords connected with the turf would speak in support of this Bill, it would have a very good effect in the country. I endorse what has been said by the most rev. Primate as to the growth of this evil, and I rejoice that a Bill has been brought in which will go a long way in checking it. In conclusion, I would again express the hope that His Majesty's Government may be willing, when the Bill gets to the House of Commons, to give it not only their assent but their strong support.

On Question, agreed to; Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the whole House on Tuesday next.

LOADING-PORT CLAUSE IN SHIPS' ARTICLES.

Lord MUSKERRY: My Lords, I rise to ask His Majesty's Government what developments have arisen regarding the negotiations between the Board of Trade and the shipowners on the loading-port clause in ships' articles; also, whether any mutual arrangement has been arrived at whereby the expense to shipowners and shipmasters and friction amongst ships' crews, arising out of the circular instructions of the Board of Trade on the interpretation of this clause, may now be removed. I would remind your Lordships that when I brought this matter before the House in May of last year I was then told that the subject was in the hands of the law officers of the Crown. I think some decision ought to have been come to by now. Only the other day at Cardiff four men belonging to a Whitby steamer were fined and ordered to forfeit twenty-nine days' pay through listening to the advice given them by the Board of Trade superintendent at Birkenhead, who told them that they were entitled to leave the ship at the final port of discharge and were not bound to proceed to the port of loading.

Lord WOLVERTON: My Lords, In answer to the Question which my noble friend has placed on the Paper I have to say that the Board of Trade have had this matter under their further consideration and have come to the conclusion that it would be desirable in the interests of all parties that an authoritative decision should be obtained. One meeting has already been held with officers of the Shipping Federation, and it is proposed to ask the representatives of that body to attend a further conference for the purpose of arranging with them the best way in which a test case can be taken.

House adjourned at a quarter past Five o'clock, to Thursday next, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 3rd May, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. Speaker laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz.:—Lancashire Electric Power Bill [Lords]. Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time.

Barnet District Gas and Water Bill; Donegal Railway Bill. Read the third time, and passed.

Doncaster Corporation Bill; Huddersfield Corporation Act, 1902 (Amendment) Bill [Lords]; Strabane, Raphoe, and Convoy Railway Bill; Surrey Commercial Dock Bill. As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

London Port and Docks Bill (by Order). Second Reading deferred till Monday, 6th June.

Liverpool and London and Globe Insurance Company [Stamp Duties]. Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That in lieu of the Stamp Duties which would have been payable upon the deeds or assurances which, in case the Bill had not been passed into an Act, would have been required to pass to and vest in the Company certain property, there be charged a stamp duty of five pounds, and such duty shall be impressed upon the certificate to be given by the Registrar of Joint Stock Companies under the third section hereof.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Resolution to be reported to-morrow.

RAILWAY BILLS (GROUP No. 8).

Mr. **HENRY HOBHOUSE** reported from the Committee on Group No. 8 of Railway Bills, That the parties opposing the London United Tramways Bill had stated that the evidence of Police Inspector E. Digby was essential to their case; and, it having been proved that his attendance could not be procured without the intervention of the House, he had been instructed to move that the said Police Inspector E. Digby do attend the said Committee to-day, at Three of the clock.

Ordered, That Police Inspector E. Digby do attend the Committee on Group No. 8 of Railway Bills to-day, at Three of the clock.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—Norwich Water Bill, without Amendment.

Great Eastern Railway (Steamboats) Bill, with Amendments.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to vary and amend the provisions of the South Staffordshire Mines Drainage Acts, 1891 and 1894; and for other purposes." [South Staffordshire Mines Drainage Bill [Lords.]

And, also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to free Maidenhead Bridge from tolls, to enable the Corporation of Maidenhead to borrow money for discharging the mortgage debt on the bridge, for vesting the Bridge Estates in the Corporation; and for other purposes in connection therewith." [Maidenhead Bridge Bill [Lords.]

South Staffordshire Mines Drainage Bill [Lords]; Maidenhead Bridge Bill [Lords]. Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

PETITIONS.

BISHOPRICS OF SOUTHWARK AND BIRMINGHAM BILL.

Petitions in favour; from Richmond; and Battersea (two); to lie upon the Table.

COUNTY COURTS ACT, 1903.

Petition from the Association of Trade Protection Societies of the United Kingdom, for alteration of law; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Aberdeen, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

HOUSE-LETTING (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Partick, against; to lie upon the Table.

LICENCES (RENEWAL).

Petitions against alteration of law; from Harrow Road; Maenclochog; Swinefleet; Sheffield; Ford; Brentwood; Uxbridge; S. H. Kearsey and others; Liverpool; Stepney (three); Moulton; Llandissilio; Ammanford; Argyle; London; Ratcliff; Waltham Abbey; Horsham (two); Folkestone; Heyford; Barrowford (two); Southsea; Nottingham; Maidstone; Chester le Street; and West Hendon; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions against; from Manchester; Aberdeen (three); London (two); South Byker; Canning Town; Islington; Newbiggin; Alston; Barrington; Broomhill; Seghill; Hexham; Grangemouth; and Chelsea; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petition from Whitehaven, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

POLLING ARRANGEMENTS (PARLIAMENTARY BOROUGHS) BILL.

Petition from Westminster, against; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.

Petition from Abingdon, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

IRISH LAND COMMISSION (RULES).

Paper [presented 2nd May] to be printed. [No. 154.]

AFRICA (No. 5, 1904).

Copy presented, of Agricultural Report on the District between Voi and Kiu in the East Africa Protectorate, by Mr. A. Linton, Director of Agriculture East

Africa Protectorate; and Return of Game shot in the Protectorate during 1903 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Copy ordered, "of Statement as to the procedure followed by the Board of Inland Revenue in ascertaining the value of property for the purposes of Estate Duty."—(*Mr. Cochrane.*)

Copy presented accordingly; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 155.]

LICENSING BILL.

Copy ordered, "of Statement showing, for each county and county borough, the number of publicans' and beerhouse Licences, and, approximately, the maximum sum leviable under the Licensing Bill in each area."—(*Mr. Cochrane.*)

Copy presented accordingly; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 156.]

TAXES AND IMPOSTS.

Return ordered, "showing (1) the Rates of Duties, Taxes, or Imposts collected by Imperial Officers; (2) the Quantities or Amounts taxed; (3) the gross receipts derived from each Duty; and (4) the Net Receipts and Appropriations thereof in the year ending the 31st day of March, 1904; and (1) the aggregate Gross Receipts derived from all such Duties, Taxes, or Imposts, under the principal heads of Revenue; (2) the aggregate Net Receipts; (3) the Charges of Collection; and (4) the Produce, after deducting these Charges on each of the ten years ending the 31st day of March, 1904."

"And, Notes to show any changes in the Taxes, Duties, and Imposts consequent upon the acceptance of the Budget Proposals of 1904 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 303, of Session 1903)."—(*Mr. Goddard.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Compensation for Licences.

MR. BAYLEY (Derbyshire, Chesterfield): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if, under the new Licensing Bill, the owner of the licence who is a servant of a brewery is entitled to compensation should he be disturbed in the public interest.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) If, as would no doubt usually be the case, a licence-holder such as the hon. Member has in mind had an interest in the premises he would be entitled to compensation; but the nature and extent of his interest and his share of the compensation money must depend on the circumstances of the actual case, and would in default of agreement be determined by quarter sessions.

Suspension of Omnibus Drivers' and Conductors' Licences.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that a system exists in the metropolis under which the Chief Commissioner of Police suspends for various periods the licence of drivers or conductors in the service of omnibus companies for offences for which they have already been punished by fine or otherwise; and, if so, whether he can see his way to promise that this practice will be reconsidered by the Chief Commissioner with a view to its modification.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) The practice to which the hon. Member draws attention is of old standing; and when, in 1864, it was brought before the Court of Queen's Bench in the case of Regina *v.* Commissioners of Police, the Court held that the suspension of the licence was within the powers of the Commissioner, and the Lord Chief Justice expressed the opinion that it was a "salutary check." The Commissioner, who exercises this power with discretion and without undue severity, considers it necessary to the preservation of proper conduct in the men, and therefore essential in the public interest, and in this view I concur.

Licences refused by Committee of Quarter Sessions—Right of Appeal.

SIR JOHN DORINGTON (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, under the provisions of the

Licensing Bill, it is intended that in the case of the refusal of a licence by the committee of quarter sessions the right of subsequent appeal to the Court of quarter sessions, as at present existing, should be retained, or whether the decision of the committee is final.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) It is intended that the decision of the committee of quarter sessions shall be final.

Compulsory Licences for British Patents.

Sir JOHN LENG (Dundee): To ask the President of the Board of Trade if he will state what provision is made by the Patent Acts and the regulations of the Board of Trade for granting compulsory licences for the manufacture of articles in the United Kingdom under British patents; what number of compulsory licences have been obtained through application to the Board of Trade for the manufacture of articles under British patents granted to persons residing abroad; and what is the total number of compulsory licences for British patents.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) The provisions now in force relating to the grant of the licences referred to are contained in Section 3 of the Patents Act, 1902, and Rules 69 to 75 of the Patents Rules, 1903. No licences have yet been granted under these provisions; but two applications for such licences are pending. Under Section 22 of the Patents, etc. Act, 1883, and the Rules formerly in force thereunder, two licences were granted, of which one was in respect of a British patent owned by a person resident abroad.

Postal Cash-on-Delivery System.

Lord WILLOUGHBY DE ERESBY (Lincolnshire, Horncastle): To ask the Postmaster-General if he intends this year to introduce the cash-on-delivery system.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) I am not as yet in a position to announce any decision on the subject; and I can only refer the hon. Member to the Answers which I have given to Questions previously asked.

New School at Hayward's Heath.

Mr. J. F. HOPE (Sheffield, Brightside): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether he can say when the report of the representative of the Board, who lately held an inquiry as to the provision of a new school at Hayward's Heath, will be deposited with the local education authority.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) The Board are in communication with the county council with a view to making the necessary arrangement for the deposit of the report. As soon as these arrangements are completed a notice of the deposit will be published by the Board. A copy of the report has already been sent to the county council for their information.

Attendance at School of Young Children Living at a Distance.

Mr. HUNT (Shropshire, Ludlow): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether, in view of the fact that complaints have been made by workmen and others in Shropshire of the distances which small children have to walk to the nearest school, and of the injury to the children caused thereby, he can issue regulations to county councils showing whether the county council can render school attendance not compulsory for children between the ages of five and seven if the school is more than one mile from their home.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) A local education authority has powers under Section 74 of the Elementary Education Act, 1870, to make by-laws limiting compulsory attendance in the case of children between five and seven to those children who reside not more than one mile from the nearest school.

Education Act—Part Payment of Rates.

Sir BRAMPTON GURDON (Norfolk, N.): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether any instructions have been given by this Department to local authorities, since the passing of the Education Act, directing overseers not to accept part payment of rates.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) The reply is in the negative.

Motor-Car Act—Report of Departmental Committee.

Mr. SHEPHERD CROSS (Bolton): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether the Departmental Committee on the Motor-Car Act have presented their Report; and, if so, when it will be printed.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) I have received the Report. It will be presented to Parliament at once.

Compensation for Damage by Explosives used for Naval Practice.

Mr. REGINALD LUCAS (Portsmouth): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether it is the custom to pay compensation for damage done to private property by explosives used in the course of naval practices, or other operations connected with His Majesty's service.

(*Answered by Mr. Pretyman.*) Every claim for compensation is carefully considered and dealt with on its merits. There is no general rule laid down.

Volunteers—Courts of Inquiry.

Sir CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state the total number of Courts of Inquiry respecting the Volunteer force in the year 1903–4 in which evidence was ordered to be taken on oath, and the battalions to which any such cases referred, who convened the Courts, and who directed evidence to be taken on oath.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) There was only one such Court in which evidence was taken on oath. The corps concerned was the 1st London Royal Engineers (Volunteers). The holding of this Court was approved by the Secretary of State for War, but actually convened under the orders of the General Officer Commanding the Home District by the Commanding Royal Engineer. This latter officer gave orders for the evidence to be taken on oath.

Indian Army—Orders for Private Firms for New Batteries.

Mr. J. F. HOPE: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can say approximately when the orders will be given for the new batteries to be made by private manufacturers for the Army in India.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) I am not yet in a position to state definitely when the new orders for the new batteries will be given, but every effort is being made to facilitate progress in this direction.

New Rifle—Increased Recoil.

Mr. HUNT: To ask the Secretary of State for War if, in view of the fact that the new rifle, from its reduced weight and the increased pressure at the breech, kicks more than the old long rifle, he will take any steps to remedy this defect.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) The question of the slight increase to recoil involved has been fully considered, and it has been decided that no steps in the matter are necessary.

Army Manœuvres in Essex—Essex Yeomanry.

Sir CARNE RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether the Essex Yeomanry, or any part of it, will be employed in the manœuvres in Essex, and if pay will be granted.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) The composition of the opposing forces at the forthcoming Army Manœuvres has not yet been finally decided. The advantage of employing local Yeomanry will not be lost sight of, and the question of paying them, if their services are utilised, will receive due consideration.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Manchester Volunteers' Camp Arrangement.

Mr. SCHWANN (Manchester, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that the mounted infantry company of the 2nd Volunteer Battalion Manchester Rifles having represented to the War Office that the Isle of Man, where the Manchester Brigade is going in Whit week, is unfit for the training of mounted men, the War Office have offered Liphook as an alternative camping ground for the company, and that the War Office have since intimated that if Liphook be chosen the company will receive no pay, and camp allowance for one week only, whereas if they go to the Isle of Man they will receive both pay and camp allowance for two weeks; and, if so, whether arrangements can be made for the company to go to a suitable training ground under the same conditions as to the Isle of Man, as they are anxious to make themselves as efficient as possible.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): This matter has already been referred to headquarters by the General Officer Commanding concerned in the proper manner, and is now receiving consideration.

Military Works in Ireland—Employment of Civilian Engineers.

MR. SULLIVAN (Westmeath, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in view of the fact that in several instances in Ireland the duties of Royal Engineer officers are being discharged by civilian engineers appointed without examination, he will state what are their qualifications and under what conditions of tenure do they serve; is he aware that these appointments have caused professional discontent in Ireland; and will he state if the appointments to the new Department of Military Works are to be made under the same conditions, or under the usual conditions of Civil Service examination and competition.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: There are a very few civilians temporarily employed in Ireland as acting engineers, and they will be replaced as soon as possible. They were engaged by the military authorities in Ireland who were satisfied that they possessed the requisite qualifications for the posts, which experience has shown to be correct. It is not known that professional discontent has been caused in Ireland. The composition of the staff of the new Works Depart- has not yet been definitely settled.

British South Africa Company—Jameson Raid Claim.

MR. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, in view of the fact that he has been advised that the claim of the late Transvaal Government against the British South Africa Company in respect of the Jameson Raid did not pass to the Home Government, the present Government of the Transvaal have in like manner been advised that this claim does not pass to them; if so, does this advice apply to any other assets of the late Transvaal Government; and on what ground is a distinction drawn between this claim and any other assets.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. LYTTELTON, Warwick and Leamington): I am not aware whether the present Transvaal Government have taken advice on the matter, but I would again refer the hon. Member to the answer of my predecessor of 1st April, 1901.† The right of the late South African Republic to press by diplomatic means for compensation for a wrong committed is not in my opinion rightly to be regarded as an asset of that Government.

MR. PIRIE: Is it not the case that the late Colonial Secretary stated that the Chartered Company would be compelled to make good the injury caused by the Jameson Raid?

MR. LYTTELTON: That might be so, but if it were so, it does not appear to have much bearing on the answer I gave that this is not an asset which passes to this Government.

MR. PIRIE: Is it not the case that the insistence on this claim by President Kruger was the cause of the late war?

[No answer was returned.]

Seistan Boundary Commission

MR. SCHWANN: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India if he will state what has been the expenditure up to date on the Seistan Boundary Commission, and what is the estimated cost up to the anticipated completion of its work next autumn; will any portion of such cost be defrayed by the Persian or Afghan

---

† See (4) *Debates*, xcii., 329.

Governments or by the British Treasury; is this Commission accompanied by any military escort; and, if so, of what strength.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford): I am unable to give the figures of the expenditure on the Seistan Boundary Commission, but I hope to receive the information shortly. The cost is estimated at rather over £5,000 a month, and, as my predecessor stated in answer to a Question last year,[†] will fall on Indian revenues. The escort with the Mission consists of one troop of native cavalry and two companies of native infantry.

Macedonian Reform—European Consuls at Monastir.

MR. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W. R., Elland): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the European Consuls in the vilayet of Monastir have been informed by the Vali that in the future no representations from them regarding outrages or abuses will be considered by him.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Earl Percy, Kensington, S.): The Vali of Monastir appears to have ignored representations made by the Austrian and Russian Consuls since the advent of the civil agents. The Austrian and Russian Ambassadors at Constantinople have, however, formally notified the Porte that the presence of the Civil Agents in no way alters the position of their Consuls, to whose representations they expect the same attention to be paid as in the past.

Macedonia.

MR. HUGH LAW (Donegal, W.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he will say, in view of the fact that a conference of insurgent leaders is to be held within two or three weeks to decide whether a fresh rising shall take place in Macedonia, what steps the Government will take to assure the people of that country that efficient control of the administration is to be established by the great Powers.

EARL PERCY: His Majesty's Government have no cognisance of, or concern in, the plans of the revolutionary leaders. They have repeatedly asserted their determination to assist and accelerate by every means in their power the prompt and effective application of the reforms already agreed upon, and the foreign officers appointed for the reorganisation of the Macedonian Gendarmerie arrived a fortnight ago at Salonica *en route* for the various districts assigned to them. His Majesty's Government earnestly hope that their presence will have a reassuring effect on the populations and prevent a renewal of the disturbances which would render nugatory the efforts which the Powers have already made on their behalf.

Death Duties—Valuation of Licensed Property.

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE (Somersetshire, E.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he will lay upon the Table of the House a Paper showing how the various interests on death of the freehold and leasehold owners and mortgagees of public-houses are valued for the purposes of the estate duty.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.): I hope that Papers on the subject will be laid this afternoon.

The Tobacco Duty.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): I desire to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer a Question, of which I have given him private notice, with reference to the tobacco duty, viz., if it is the practice to refund the Customs duty on stripped stalks; how those stalks are disposed of, and what is the estimated revenue from the additional duties on cigars and cigarettes?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The hon. Member does not seem quite to understand the point. Duty is not at present returned upon stalks of tobacco stripped in this country, unless they have been ground into snuff and exported or deposited in a bonded or King's warehouse. Drawback is then allowed at the rate of 3s. 1d. for each lb. of the offal snuff, according to a certain standard. But the ground stalks fall much below

---

[*] See (4) *Debates*, cxviii. 1232.

the standard fixed, and it requires therefore more than 1 lb. of stalks to produce 1 lb. of standard offal. It appears that the actual drawback value of stalks as offal does not average more than about 2s. 7d. a lb. The offal snuff is generally denatured and used for the production of nicotine, sheep-dip, blight powder, etc. The estimate of the amount to be received from the additional duty on cigars is £45,000, and from that on cigarettes £20,000. I may add I have received some evidence showing that the grinding of the stalks before they are used for nicotine and other purposes renders them less valuable than they would be unground.

Racing News by Wireless Telegraphy.

*MR. MONTAGU (Huntingdonshire, Huntingdon): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether his attention has been called to the fact that recently a Marconi instrument has been set up upon Newmarket racecourse for the purpose of the distribution of news; and, if so, what steps he proposes to take to put a stop to similar action in the future.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): My attention has been called to the fact that endeavours have been made to distribute racing results by means of wireless telegraphy and I am now in communication with the persons concerned.

Post Office Wages Committee.

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General when the Report of Sir Edward Bradford's Committee on the terms of service of certain classes of postal employees may be expected; and whether this House will be afforded an opportunity of discussing the Report of the Committee.

LORD STANLEY: I am unable to say when the Report of Sir Edward Bradford's Committee will be presented. With regard to the second part of the Question, I am unable at present to give any such assurances as the hon. Member asks for.

Smallpox in East London.

SIR THOMAS DEWAR (Tower Hamlets, St. George's): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board in view of the recent outbreak of smallpox in East London, can he state to what cause it is attributed, and how many patients have been removed for treatment from the various districts of London by the Metropolitan Asylums Board.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.): I am unable to specify the precise causes to which the outbreak referred to is to be attributed, but I may state that several cases occurred in some common lodging-houses and seamen's boarding-houses in Stepney and Poplar, and the earliest of these cases seem to have been those of some cattlemen who came from America. The number of patients removed to the hospitals of the Metropolitan Asylums Board from the various districts of London from 1st March to 29th April was 242.

Rats and the Spread of Plague.

SIR THOMAS DEWAR: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware that vessels entering French ports from plague-infected ports are not allowed to load until the owners have had such vessels fumigated for the purpose of securing the destruction of any rats which may be on board; and having regard to the remarks contained in the last annual Report of the Medical Officer of Health for the Port of London, and the prevalence of plague in the Far East, will the question of adopting regulations similar to those in force in France be considered.

MR. WALTER LONG: I am aware of the decree made by the French Government with regard to this matter. That decree was, however, issued before the recent international conference at Paris took place. The provisions on this subject included in the convention made as the result of the conference are less stringent than those of the decree. The convention is now under the consideration of the Governments concerned. It has been the practice of my Department to recommend the destruction of rats on board vessels coming from plague-infected ports, when the vessels are empty, but it has not been thought necessary to make this compulsory.

Dartmoor Prison Staff's Quarters.

Mr. CLAUDE HAY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that only two-thirds of the prison staff at Princetown are provided with housing accommodation; that in the older barrack quarters the rooms are small and insufficient in height; and that, owing to the supply by the prison authorities of accommodation for the prison staff being insufficient, working men in Princetown have difficulty in securing houses at rents within their means, although ample land is available upon which accommodation should be provided for the prison staff by the Government; and whether he will cause special inquiry to be made to secure adequate accommodation for all prison officials, seeing that land can be acquired from the Government at a reasonable price for the housing of other workmen in the vicinity.

The SECRETARY of STATE for the HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. Akers-Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's): Out of 235 officers at Dartmoor Convict Prison 185 or more than three-fourths are now living in quarters provided by the Government. The Directors are contemplating the building of additional quarters, and this scheme would probably involve the demolition of some of the old barrack quarters, the accommodation in which is admitted to be deficient, and would incidentally increase the supply of working-class accommodation available in Princetown. There is no difficulty about a site and the Directors will proceed with the work of providing quarters for officers at Dartmoor and other prisons as rapidly as the funds available will permit, but I cannot pledge them to give Dartmoor priority over other places where the needs may be more urgent.

Off-Licence Holders and the Licensing Bill.

Mr. SAMUEL YOUNG (Cavan, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether the holders of off-licences shall come under the provisions of the Licensing Bill now before the House.

Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS: At the Committee stage of the Bill the Government will be ready to put on the Paper an Amendment showing the extent to which, and the conditions on which, they are prepared to include off-licences in the Bill.

Roscommon Maiden Quarter Sessions.

Mr. HAYDEN (Roscommon, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the fact that there was no criminal business at several recent quarter sessions in the county Roscommon, and of the inconvenience and expense to jurors of being brought long distances without any cause, he will issue instructions to have the county scheduled for the purpose of notifying jurors that they are not required to attend on such occasions as those referred to.

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Mr. Wyndham, Dover): The question of applying the provisions of the Quarter Sessions Jurors' Act of 1897 to the county Roscommon, with the view of obviating the inconveniences pointed out by the hon. Member, is at present before the Lord-Lieutenant in council.

Irish Emigration Statistics.

Dr. AMBROSE (Mayo, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the Report of the Emigration Statistics for Ireland for the year 1903, in which it is stated that 40,659 people, 19,303 young men and 21,356 young women, left the country during the year; and whether, seeing that the province of Connaught has supplied more than one-fourth of the total number—viz. 11,504, he will see that a Commission of inquiry is appointed with a view to finding out the cause and effect of such emigration from Connaught and its remedy.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The number of persons, natives of Ireland, who emigrated in 1903 was 39,789. Their composition according to sex and age (from one year upwards) will be found at page nine of the Statistical Report. The numbers show a decrease as compared with 1902. No useful object would be served by appointing a Commission, as suggested.

Mr. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): Can the Chief Secretary say why these people are leaving Ireland?

[No answer was returned.]

Irish Training Colleges and Free Homes.

Mr. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the resolution signed by the Cardinal Archbishop of Armagh, in which the standing committee of the Roman Catholic Bishops of Ireland complain of the refusal of free homes to the training colleges at Belfast, Waterford, and Limerick as unfair to these colleges, and as tending, by reducing the resources which are necessary for their efficient working, injuriously to affect the whole primary system of education in the country; and whether he proposes to make any statement in answer to this grave pronouncement of the Bishops.

Mr. WYNDHAM: Yes, Sir, I have seen a published report of the resolution. I cannot consider a departure from the understanding that free homes should be granted only to metropolitan training colleges, except as part of the general question of educational reform.

Falchorrib and Gortnasate Works.

Mr. HUGH LAW: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can now say whether the estimate and plans for the works proposed to be executed at Falchorrib and Gortnasate, under the Marine Works Act, have been completed; and when the construction of these piers will be begun.

Mr. WYNDHAM: There has been delay in the case of the proposed works at Gortnasate in consequence of the form of agreement forwarded by the county council not having been dated or attested. It is now before the Treasury and I expect to have its decision very shortly. The estimate for Falchorrib, provisionally set down at £1,000, has been increased to £2,500. In view of the decision of the county council to withhold their co-operation from the works agreed upon last year at Portnoo, Cladnageragh and Downing's Bay, I doubt whether this is an opportune moment to approach them again on the question of Falchorrib.

Rossbeg (Donegal) Landing Place.

Mr. HUGH LAW: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can now say what decision has been arrived at by the Congested Districts Board with regard to the provision of additional landing accommodation for fishing boats at Rossbeg, county Donegal.

Mr. WYNDHAM: Provision has been made by the Board for the expenditure of a sum of £107 on works of improvement at Rossbeg landing place.

Irish Motor-Car Services.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the proposed motor-car services are to be started this summer in Ireland.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The proposed motor-car services will be started as soon as the necessary steps have been completed for putting the roads in order.

Mr. FLAVIN: And what steps have been taken to secure that?

[No answer was returned.]

Tarbet Tourist Steamers—Government Subsidy.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether arrangements can be made during the summer for a service of steamers, aided by a Government subsidy, between Kilrush and Foynes.

Mr. WYNDHAM: I cannot hold out any hope that the subsidy in the case of the Tarbet to Kilrush steamer will be continued beyond the 31st instant.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND: Will not the right hon. Gentleman reconsider the matter seeing that nearly everybody in the district has signed a petition in favour of granting the subsidy?

Mr. WYNDHAM: The question has often been before me, but I cannot see my way to finding the funds at present.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND: Will the right hon. Gentleman try to find the funds?

Mr. WYNDHAM: If I can.

Colclough Estate, Wexford.

Mr. FFRENCH (Wexford, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that in the hearing of the case of the Colclough Estate before the Land Judge's Court, the Land Judge said that although the estate was put in Court for sale he had no power to sell it; and, if so, whether, seeing that this estate has been in Court for twenty years, during which no steps were taken to bring the matter to a sale until the tenants themselves applied to the receiver, steps will be taken to expedite its sale to the tenants.

Mr. WYNDHAM: A receiver was appointed over this estate by one of the Chancery Judges. The case only comes before the Land Judge because he is the Judge having jurisdiction over receivers. The Judge of the Chancery Division never ordered the estate to be sold, and it did not, therefore, come before the Land Judge for sale. The Land Judge has no power to sell the estate, nor did he ever say that the estate was in his Court for sale.

Ballymahon Magisterial Bench.

Mr. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that three vacancies recently existed on the magisterial bench of Ballymahon; whether he is aware that two of these vacancies have been filled by the recent appointment of two Protestant gentlemen to the bench; will he state on whose recommendation these appointments were made; and whether any recommendation from the local authority for the appointment of a Roman Catholic to the third vacancy will be considered.

Mr. WYNDHAM: There were two vacancies, caused by the deaths of Protestant justices. Three gentlemen (Protestants) have been appointed on the recommendation of the Lieutenant of the county. The Lord Chancellor and Lieutenant of the county will be happy to consider any representations made to them in favour of the appointment of Roman Catholic gentlemen to the commission of the peace.

Irish Poor Law Unions and Military Patients.

Mr. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, whether any liability is imposed on Poor Law Unions in Ireland to receive infectious and non-infectious cases into their hospitals from military barracks; and whether, if such local authorities agree to accept such cases, proper care will be taken that no loss will be put upon the ratepayers in consequence of the extra charges incurred.

Mr. WYNDHAM: There is no obligation on the part of boards of guardians to admit military patients to workhouse hospitals. But I am informed by the War Department that in all instances where arrangements are made with the local authorities for the reception of infectious cases occurring amongst troops or their families, the charges agreed upon for their maintenance are defrayed by the Department.

Irish Land Purchase Statistics.

Mr. FFRENCH: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will say when the Annual Return of the Land Commission for the year ending 31st March, 1904, will be published; how many estates were sold by the Land Judge under Section 40 of the Land Act of 1896 since the new Land Act of 1903 came into force; and how many estates have appeared each week on the Land Judge's list for sale under that section since the Land Act of 1903 came into force.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The Annual Report of the Commissioners for the year 1903–4 will, it is expected, be ready for presentation to Parliament in July or August next. The interim Returns of proceedings under the Act of 1903, which I have undertaken to lay shortly on the Table, will contain information in respect of sales in the Land Judge's Court.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): Can the right hon. Gentleman say why this Report will not be ready till July or August? Does he not recognise the importance of our having it in time to discuss it on the Estimates?

MR. WYNDHAM: I do not think it has ever been laid before the Estimates were taken.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Under the peculiar circumstances now obtaining, will the right hon. Gentleman endeavour to lay the Report in time for us to discuss it.

MR. WYNDHAM: I will see what can be done.

Irish Evicted Tenants.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners will be instructed, with a view to securing grazing tracts of land for the settlement of evicted tenants, to send an inspector into the large grazing districts to report upon suitable properties for sale; and whether, in such cases, the seventh and eighth Sections of the Act of 1903 will be enforced, if possible.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Commissioners are not in a position effectively to initiate inquiries of this character pending the settlement of the question of the payment of the bonus in respect of untenanted lands. When that question is determined the matter will be further considered. Such inquiries are now made when an owner offers untenanted lands to the Commissioners.

The Education Code and the Irish Language.

MR. BOLAND: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether, in framing the new Education Code, he will arrange to include the Irish language as an optional subject in view of the fact that in a number of schools throughout the country Irish children are predominant in number, and in view of its literary value.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir WILLIAM ANSON, Oxford University): Article 16 of the existing Code permits, where it is found desirable, the inclusion in the course of instruction of other subjects besides those actually mentioned in the Code. This provision will be retained in the forthcoming Code, and I do not think that anything further is necessary.

MR. BOLAND: May I ask if it is possible to include the Irish language in the new Code?

SIR WILLIAM ANSON was understood to reply that it was not possible to do so in so many words, but under the provisions of the Code it was allowable to treat certain subjects as optional, and this might come under that head.

The Irish Dictionary.

MR. BOLAND: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, can he state what progress has been made by Dr. Atkinson in the compilation of the Irish dictionary; how many years has it been in hand; and can he state how much money has been paid from State funds for this object to the Royal Irish Academy.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY (Mr. VICTOR CAVENDISH, Derbyshire, W.): I am informed that since 1880 transcribers skilled in the Irish language have been employed to extract from all branches of Irish literature the materials for this dictionary, and that this preliminary stage is now so nearly completed that it is hoped to begin the printing of the work after the summer vacation. The amount expended for this purpose since 1880 out of the annual grant in aid to the Royal Irish Academy is £3,790. 9s.

Irish Local Loans—Rate of Interest.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, in view of the price at which the recent flotation of the Irish Land Loan was effected and the present ease in the money market, the former rate of interest to Irish local bodies will be restored.

MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH: The present rates of interest on loans out of the Local Loans Fund to local authorities in Great Britain as well as in Ireland, were fixed by a Treasury Minute of the 3rd March last. There has since been some improvement in money-market conditions; but it would be necessary to have much longer experience of the extent and stability of that improvement before a further change of the rates could be considered.

Mr. J. P. FARRELL: Is there any fixed period for revising the rates?

Mr. VICTOR CAVENDISH: No, but it is done from time to time.

Female Supervisors in the Dublin Post Office.

Mr. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he is aware that men are frequently supervised by females in Dublin; can he say if this practice is general throughout the entire service; and, if not, will he make arrangements to have the practice discontinued.

Lord STANLEY: As a general rule men are not placed under the supervision of women—I am only speaking from the postal point of view—but there are some cases, as at Dublin, where it is necessary to employ some of the junior sorting clerks and telegraphists at telegraph circuits which are under female supervision. I do not see any serious objection to this, and it would not be practicable, under existing circumstances, to arrange otherwise.

American Mail Delays at Queenstown.

Mr. NANNETTI: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he is aware that a portion of the American mail landed at Queenstown on the 1st April was sent unsorted to London and Liverpool; can he say why the controller of the Dublin sorting office does not train a sufficient number of men to be able to cope with the mail; and will he explain why the same steps are not taken in Ireland as in England to secure the efficient handling of homeward-bound American mails.

Lord STANLEY: The American mail landed from the "Campania" at Queenstown on the 1st April consisted of 1,942 bags. Three bags were sent unsorted to Liverpool owing to the train from Queenstown to Dublin having performed the journey in twenty minutes less time than usual, and to the sorters having a correspondingly reduced time for their work. Some of the London correspondence, which is sorted between North Wall and Crewe, was sent unsorted to London in consequence of the sorting boxes not being at once available on board the packet; but the time of delivery of the correspondence in London was not affected by this irregularity. There is a sufficient number of trained sorters to provide for the service; and, except for the occurrence of circumstances which cannot be foreseen, the arrangements for dealing with these mails are adequate.

Mr. NANNETTI: May I ask if the noble Lord will, in view of the fact that the Irish railways are endeavouring to facilitate the traffic, see that these mails are not delayed by having to be sent to London? I ask this in view of the importance of retaining Queenstown as the mail route.

Lord STANLEY: Certainly, and when I find that the increase of speed is usual and not exceptional I will make other arrangements to meet it.

Captain DONELAN (Cork County, E.): Can the same facilities be afforded for handling the mails between Queenstown and Dublin as between Plymouth and London?

Lord STANLEY: Oh, yes.

Irish Sorters and the Irish Language.

Mr. BOLAND: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether, in view of the number of letters addressed in Irish which pass through the Post Office in Ireland, he will arrange to have Irish added as an optional subject in the examination for sorters.

Lord STANLEY: I do not think that sufficient reason has been shown for adopting the hon. Member's suggestion.

Irish Postmasters and the Irish Language.

Mr. BOLAND: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that, in the case of letters addressed in Irish, delay has occurred in the delivery of letters through country post offices in Ireland; and whether he will recognise the desirability of requiring a knowledge of Irish in future appointments to postmasterships.

Lord STANLEY: In my opinion there is not sufficient reason for requiring a knowledge of the Irish language from persons appointed to be postmasters in Ireland.

Mr. BOLAND: If I bring cases of delay to the notice of the noble Lord will he reconsider this question?

Lord STANLEY: No, I cannot.

Irish Northern District Superintending Engineer's Staff.

Mr. NANNETTI: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that the superintending engineer in the Irish northern district, at Belfast, takes upon himself the responsibility of saying where his clerical staff shall reside; and whether this is in conformity with the rules of the service.

Lord STANLEY: I find that the superintending engineer referred to was recently asked by his senior clerk in Belfast whether there was any rule governing the distance from the post office within which a servant of the department must reside. He replied that he was not aware of any rule, but that every member of the staff is expected to reside within such a distance from the office as to be accessible, if required, at an emergency. This reply was quite right; and the question of the application of this principle in any particular case is one within the discretion of the superintending engineer.

Templetown Postal Arrangements.

Mr. FFRENCH: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that the electoral division of Templetown has no post office, and no delivery at all from Saturday until Monday, although it contains an area of 5,000 acres and about 1,000 inhabitants; and, if so, whether he will look into the matter with a view to provide postal facilities for that division.

Lord STANLEY: The question of opening a post office and affording a Sunday delivery at Templetown has already been under consideration, but, as the cost of the postal service in the district is very high as compared with the amount of correspondence, the desired facilities cannot, I regret to say, be provided at the cost of the revenue. There is reason, however, to think that the residents are prepared to guarantee the cost, and a communication was sent some weeks ago acquainting them with the amount it would be necessary for them to guarantee.

Belturbet Post Office.

Mr. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that objection is being expressed in Belturbet to the proposed one-story new post office in that town, and that the Belturbet Urban Council has passed a resolution calling for the erection of a suitable office; and, if so, will he direct that the plans be reconsidered with a view to building a proper sized office.

Lord STANLEY: I am not aware that any local objection has been raised to the plans for the proposed new post office at Belturbet. The accommodation in the new office will provide adequately for the work and no reasonable objection can, I think, be taken to the fact that the building will consist of one story only.

Mr. J. P. FARRELL: If I send to the noble Lord a memorial, will he reconsider his decision?

Lord STANLEY: It will not be reconsidered if the only substance of it is the objection to the one-story building.

Mr. J. P. FARRELL: That is all.

Lord STANLEY: Then I cannot reconsider it.

Baltimore Postal Service.

Mr. GILHOOLY (Cork County, W.): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that the mid-day mail for Baltimore arriving at Skibbereen is detained there sixteen hours, though a train arrives at 2.34 p.m. each day at Baltimore by which that mail could be sent, and that there is only one outward mail at 5.25 p.m. from Baltimore; and, if so, whether, in view of the importance of Baltimore as a fishing station, he will give better postal arrangements.

LORD STANLEY: Inquiries have been instituted on the question of affording a second post at Baltimore, and an answer shall be sent to the hon. Member as soon as they are completed.

Longford Post Office Night Work.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he will cause inquiry to be made in Longford into the arrangements for stamping, labelling, and packing parcels at night, with a view to some arrangement being made either for the employment of a special despatch clerk at the work, or remuneration being given to the night postman, who at present is, on turn, compelled to do the work.

LORD STANLEY: I am having inquiry made and will communicate the result to the hon. Member.

Transvaal Opinion on the Chinese Labour Question.

MAJOR SEELY (Isle of Wight): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in view of the statement made by the late Colonial Secretary that during his tenure of office he laid down the principle that the permission of the Imperial Government for the employment of Asiatic labour in South Africa should be conditional on its being clearly shown that such employment was desired by the great majority of the white inhabitants of the two Colonies, he will state whether His Majesty's Government now consider themselves bound by this pledge; and, if so, what is the nature of the evidence in their possession showing that this importation of Asiatic labour is desired by the great majority of the white inhabitants of the two Colonies.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): The statement made by my right hon friend the Member for West Birmingham on the part of the Government of which he was a member was that in respect of this question of yellow labour he would endeavour as far as possible to treat the Transvaal as a self-governing colony. I am not sure that I quite appreciate the point of the Question—whether it lies in the reference to both Colonies—whether he thinks that a pledge was given that the Orange Colony should be required to give its assent to anything done in the Transvaal, and reciprocally that anything done in the Orange Colony should require the assent of the Transvaal. If that is my hon. friend's view it is not one which has ever been held by the Government, or so far as I know, by my right hon. friend.

MAJOR SEELY: May I explain that my Question is based upon a letter written by the right hon. Member for West Birmingham of which the Question is a transcript? The words in the Question are his actual words with reference to both Colonies. If the Prime Minister cannot answer the first part of the Question will be give an answer to the latter part?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I understand the statement of policy, made not merely on my right hon. friend's own behalf but on behalf of the Government of which he was a member and which we all accept, was that he would treat these Colonies in the matter of Chinese labour and in all matters as self-governing colonies. Broadly speaking, that was the purport of the answer. Then my right hon. friend wrote a letter from which a sentence or phrase has been extracted by my hon. and gallant friend. but the letter goes on in this way—"I stated that in all matters in which Imperial interests were not directly affected, I considered the only safe and proper policy was to treat the Colonies as though they enjoyed self-government, the concession of which was only a question of time." I entirely adhere to that statement. I believe it accurately represents what was the policy of the Government when my right hon. friend was a member of it, and what is still the policy of the Government. That statement does not imply, as my hon. and gallant friend appears to think, that the Orange River Colony is to have a voice in what concerns only the Transvaal, and the Transvaal a voice in what only concerns the Orange River Colony. As regards the latter part of the Question, we have over and over again stated that, in our view at all events, all the indications point to the public opinion in the Transvaal being entirely in favour of the employment of Chinese labour, and no indication comes to us from that colony to show that there is any change of opinion, or if there be a change of opinion, it is more than ever in the direction in which His Majesty's Government have proceeded.

MR. EUGENE WASON (Clackmannan and Kinross): Is not the right hon. Gentleman aware that less than twelve months ago a mass meeting in the Transvaal unanimously protested against the importation of Chinese labour?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes, but that was more than ten months ago.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND asked the right hon. Gentleman whether, in order to set this matter at rest once and for ever, he would give an opportunity to the people of the Transvaal to give a straight vote, yes or no, upon the question?

*MR. SPEAKER: That is a Question of which notice should be given.

Private Members' Bills.

MR. TREVELYAN: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he will take steps to amend the Standing Orders so as to secure that Bills introduced by private Members which have passed their Second Reading shall be sent, without further debate or division, to such Committee as the Speaker or Chairman of Committees shall select.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No, Sir, I do not think I can make myself responsible for such a change in Standing Orders as the hon. Member suggests.

Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Irregularities.

MR. BRYNMOR JONES (Swansea District): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can now advise the variation of the terms of reference to the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Irregularities so that the said terms shall run, to inquire into the nature and extent of ecclesiastical disorders, the teaching or profession by the Bishops and clergy of the Church of England of doctrines inconsistent with the Law of this Realm, into proposed legislative remedies, and into matters connected therewith.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I think I gave reasons in my speech on the Motion for adjournment why I did not think that questions of doctrine should be included in the reference to the Commission, and I see no reason to alter that opinion.

Naval Prizes of War.

SIR E. DURNING-LAWRENCE (Cornwall, Truro): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether it is proposed to introduce the Bill consolidating the various Acts relating to naval prizes of war.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I should be very glad to see this Bill pass its Second Reading and be referred to a Standing Committee, and I hope some opportunity may be found for advancing it through these stages.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): Is it not down for Second Reading today?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I am bound to say I think it is controversial.

Anglo-French Agreement.

MR. GEORGE ORMSBY-GORE (Shropshire, Oswestry): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can now state a date when the provisions of the French Agreement may be considered by the House.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not think it will be possible to find a day either this week or next week for a discussion of the Anglo-French Agreement, and I doubt whether I shall be able to find a date before the Whitsuntide holidays.

Re-election on Acceptance of Ministerial Office.

MR. FORDE RIDLEY (Bethnal Green, S.W.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether it is the intention of the Government to proceed this session with the Bill for removing the necessity for re-election in the case of acceptance of office by Members of the House of Commons.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I am extremely anxious that this change in our constitutional law and practice should be carried out. I have always believed that our present system is cumbrous and wholly inapplicable to modern conditions. If I can, I shall introduce the Bill, and, should it meet with general approval, I see no reason why it should not become law. It will be impossible, I think, to press it on as a controversial measure; but as it concerns the interests of both sides of the House, and cannot come into operation in the course of the present Parliament, and as there are people who think that if its operation is deferred till next Parliament it may be that the other side will get more advantage from it than ourselves, possibly it will be received not unfavourably by those who may be expected most to gain from it.

***Sir CHARLES DILKE** (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that on the last occasion a Bill with a similar object was objected to on its introduction and rejected?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I am aware of that, and it has always seemed to me an extraordinary instance of Parliamentary short-sightedness.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND: Can the right hon. Gentleman state for the public convenience when the next Parliament is likely to meet?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: As far as I remember, I do not think this Parliament can go on for more than three-and-a-half years.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND: I am not quite so sure of that.

Standing Orders.

Mr. BATHURST (Gloucestershire, Cirencester): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether it is proposed, and if so when, to complete the terms of the Standing Order (Order in the House), and to resume the discussion on that Order which was adjourned on 13th February, 1903.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Member will gather from previous answers as to the condition of public business that it is hardly such as would enable me to fix a time to complete the remodelling of this Rule, which I admit is a subject worthy of the attention of Parliament at the earliest opportunity.

Welsh Educational Deadlock.

Captain CLIVE (Herefordshire, Ross): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in view of the neglect of certain local authorities to provide children in many elementary public schools in Wales with adequate means of instruction and necessary comforts, it is the intention of the Government to take the further stages of the Defaulting Authorities Bill as rapidly as possible.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes, Sir, I am anxious to get on with this measure as fast as possible.

The Licensing Bill.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): I wish to ask when the right hon. Gentleman will be able to lay on the Table of the House certain Returns promised relating to licensed houses, as to their valuation and the amount of the fund available in each district. The information is essential before the Licensing Bill can be adequately discussed.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I am obliged to the right hon. Gentleman for his courteous letter of yesterday. A statement showing for each county and county borough the number of public-house and beer-house licences, and approximately the maximum sum leviable under the Bill in each area, will be laid on the Table of the House to-day. There will also be laid on the Table a short statement as to the procedure followed by the Inland Revenue in ascertaining the value of property for the purposes of estate duty. I hope that copies will be in the Vote Office to-morrow.

The Aliens Bill.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar): I see that the Home Secretary has put down a notice to refer the Aliens Bill to a Grand Committee. I presume the right hon. Gentleman will give the House adequate notice before the Motion to refer the Bill, because I think that in many quarters it will meet with strenuous opposition.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I shall be sorry if the Motion receives the strenuous opposition which the hon. Member has indicated, especially if the opposition is conducted by the hon. Gentleman. The Government will not be able to carry the Motion unless in the opinion of the House there is adequate time given for it. I recognise that some time must necessarily be given.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Is this regarded as a sort of non-contentious Bill that usually goes to a Grand Committee?

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON: I hope that notice will be given of the Motion. This is a Bill mentioned first in the King's Speech, and in the opinion of many of us it is too important a measure to send to a Grand Committee.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not think that the fact of a Bill having been mentioned first in the King's Speech is any reason for treating it so as to make it improbable that the measure can be passed into law.

Sittings of the House.

Mr. FITZROY (Northamptonshire, S.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, for the convenience of Members generally, the Government will propose an Amendment of the Standing Order (Sittings of the House) so as to provide that the House shall meet at 2.30, and that Questions shall begin at 2.45.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: In answer to my hon. friend, I have to say that I have never regarded the meeting at 2 o'clock and the commencement of Questions at 2.15 as a necessary and integral part of the reform of the Rules of the House which we initiated some two years back; but I do not know that any agreement has been come to among Members as to what precise alteration should be made in the Rule to make it more convenient. I should be quite prepared, if there were a general consensus of opinion and we could be sure of passing a change in the Rule without discussion, to consider any proposals that might be made, but to give up a day to debate alterations and discuss endless Amendments of the Rule would be impossible in the present state of public business.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Has the Leader of the House any information to give as to the business of the House?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I think that the House is well acquainted with the general course of business except as to the Supply which will be taken on Thursday. As the result of communications which have passed I think that the Scotch Estimates had better be taken on Thursday.

SAVINGS BANKS ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

Reported, with Amendments, from the Standing Committee on Trade, etc.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 157.]

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 157.]

Bill, as amended (in the Standing Committee), to be taken into consideration upon Friday, 17th June, and to be printed. [Bill 174.]

POLICE SUPERANNUATION BILL.

Reported, with Amendments, from the Standing Committee on Trade, etc.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 158.]

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 158.]

Bill, as amended (in the Standing Committee), to be taken into consideration upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 173.]

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES.)

MR. HALSEY reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Member from the Standing Committee on Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing) Shipping, and Manufactures:—Mr Victor Cavendish; and had appointed in substitution: Sir John Barrington Simeon.

Report to lie upon the Table.

STANDING ORDERS.

Resolutions reported from the Select Committee.

1. "That, in the case of the City of London (Central Criminal Court House), Petition for Bill, the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with. That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill."

2. "That, in the case of the Richard Jaeger's Patent Bill [Lords], the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with. That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill."

Resolutions agreed to.

NEW BILL.

SUNDAY TRADING (SCOTLAND) BILL.

"For the regulation and control of Sunday Trading in Scotland." Presented by Mr. Cameron Corbett; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 175.]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (WAYS AND MEANS.)

Motion made, and Question put, "That the proceedings on the Reports of the Committee of Ways and Means, if under discussion at Twelve o'clock this night, be not interrupted under the Standing Order (Sittings of the House)."—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

The House divided:—Ayes, 240; Noes, 163. (Division List, No. 104.)

AYES.

Allhusen, Augustus Hen. Eden
Allsopp, Hon. George
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arnold-Forster, Rt.Hn.HughO
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt.Hn.Sir H.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A.J.(Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Mich. Hicks
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Boulnois, Edmund
Bowles, Lt.-Col.H.F(Middlesex
Bowles, T. Gibson (King'sLynn
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Bull, William James
Campbell, Rt.Hn.J.A.(Glasgow
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, RtHn.J.A(Worc.
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Rt.Hn.Sir John C. R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim,S,)
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies, Sir H. D. (Chatham)
Denny, Colonel
Dewar Sir T.R (Tower Hamlets
Dickson, Charles Scott
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hn. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt.Hn.Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fergusson,Rt.Hn.Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzroy,Hon. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, P. S. (Warwick, S.W.)
Fyler, John Arthur
Galloway, William Johnson
Garfit, William
Gordon, Hn.J.E.(Elgin&Nairn)
Gordon, Maj. E. (T'r Hamlets)
Gore,Hn G.R.C.Ormsby-(Salop
Gore, Hon.S.F.Ormsby-(Linc.)
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton,Marq of(L'nd'nderry

Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, A. Howard (Hanley)
Heath, James (Staffords., N.W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse,Rt Hn.H(Somers't,E
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Hutton, John (Yorks., N.R.)
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Kennaway, Rt.Hn.Sir John H.
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop
Kerr, John
Knowles, Sir Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, J. Grant(Yorks., N.R.
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Chas.W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hon. W. (Bristol, S.)
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J.(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Calmont, Colonel James
M'Iver,Sir Lewis(Edinburgh,W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Malcolm, Ian
Maxwell, W.J.H.(Dumfriessh.)
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Middlemore, Jn. Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Mitchell, William (Burnley)
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Randles, John S.
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, Hon.M.W.(Stalybridge
Ridley, S. Forde(Bethnal Green
Ritchie, Rt.Hn.Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Sir H. S. (Limehouse)
Sandys, Lt.-Col. Thos. Myles
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, Sir H.(Renfrew)
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford,East)
Smith,H C(North'mb.Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent,Col.Sir C. E. H(Sheff'ld
Walrond, Rt.Hn.Sir WilliamH.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col.A.C.E(Taunton
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und.Lyn
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wilson, J.W.(Worcestersh.,N.)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W.H.(Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt.Hn. E.R.(Bath
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES, Sir Alexander-Acland - Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ambrose, Robert
Asher, Alexander
Austin, Sir John
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth, C. B.
Black, Alexander William
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Crean, Eugene
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan)
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Edwards, Frank
Ellice,CaptE.C.(S.Andrw'sBghs
Evans, Sir F. H. (Maidstone)
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Ffrench, Peter
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)

Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gilhooly, James
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Lewis V.(Rossendale
Hayden, John Patrick
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Leese, Sir Jos. F. (Accrington)
Levy, Maurice
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William
Mooney, John J.
Morley, Rt.Hn.John (Montrose
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Doherty, William
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Jas. (Roscommon, N.)
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Palmer, Sir Chas. M. (Durham)
Partington, Oswald
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt.Hn.C.R(Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, D. Alfred (Merthyr)
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Jn. Cathcart (Orkney)
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, Sir J.T(Huddersf'd
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. William M'Arthur and Mr. Causton.

WAYS AND MEANS [19TH APRIL] REPORT.

Order read, for Further Consideration of Second Resolution.

CUSTOMS—TOBACCO.

"That the duties of Customs payable under section one of The Finance Act, 1898, on manufactured tobacco shall, on and after the 20th day of April, 1904, be increased, in the case of cigars, by six pence per pound, and in the case of cigarettes by one shilling per pound, and the duties payable under the same section on unmanufactured tobacco shall, on and after the same date, be increased, in the case of stripped tobacco, by three pence per pound."

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution."

MR. ROBSON (South Shields) said that the increased duties which were the subject matter of the Resolution would be opposed on many grounds. He would oppose them on one ground only, and that was because they were unmistakably and almost avowedly protectionist duties. The Chancellor of the Exchequer in introducing them quoted from a speech made by Mr. Gladstone in 1863, when he said the right hon. Gentleman argued in favour of these proposals. The House and the country had become familiar with researches into Mr. Gladstone's speeches for some scraps which might give some kind of colour to protectionist argument. When such quotations were made Mr. Gladstone was wont to ask that the context should be read; and when the context was read it was generally to the confusion of Mr. Gladstone's opponent. The same method might apply to-day; but he did not desire to take up time by adopting this ancient mode of controversy. It was enough to say that Mr. Gladstone was in 1863 engaged in adjusting taxation so as to extend the principles of free trade, and it was fair that what he said should be interpreted by what he did.

The same might apply to the utterances of the present Chancellor. They would judge his free-trade utterances by the measures he proposed. The paramount question now was whether those duties were protective or not. The right hon. Gentleman in introducing the Budget seemed to have taken a leaf out of the dialectical methods of the Prime Minister, who said they must look at the motive and that if a duty was not intended to be protective it must not be called protective. That was an ingenious way of dealing with protectionist duties under present circumstances. So far as cigars were concerned the new duty was obviously protective, because it was put upon the foreign product and there was no corresponding Excise on the home product. That was a measure novel to our fiscal policy and required some justification. The Chancellor said it was a luxury tax. What was a luxury tax? It was imposed simply for the sake of revenue. It was not, like the sumptuary tax of ancient days, to curtail private or domestic extravagance but for purposes of revenue. They had only just learnt that the revenue to be derived from the tax on cigarettes was £20,000 a year, and from cigars £45,000 a year. No one could believe—he said it with all respect to the right hon. Gentleman—that a tax of £20,000 a year was imposed for the purpose of revenue. This new tax meant a derangement of values as between different kinds of stocks and endless petty interferences with the ordinary course of business. Did the Chancellor of the Exchequer really suppose that a revenue of £20,000 a year compensated for that kind of disturbance of business? Certainly not. Therefore the House was entitled to say that a new tax, *primâ facie* protectionist, did not derive any free-trade character by being described as a luxury tax. The pretence of free-trade principles with which the right hon. Gentleman sought to disguise the character of the new taxes soon passed away, and they had a much more frank avowal of the right hon. Gentleman's motives and principles when they came to the taxation of raw materials. The right hon. Gentleman had told them that of the tobacco imported into this country for the purposes of manufacture 13½ per cent. came as whole leaf and 77 per cent. came in a slightly manufactured form, that was to say the mid rib had been stripped from the leaf. The right hon. Gentleman thereupon discovered an industry which he could assist—he (Mr. Robson) had almost said create, because it had never existed to any large extent in this country. The right hon. Gentleman had said that that industry used to be carried on to a considerable extent in this country; that at one time a large proportion of the tobacco came here in an unstripped condition; that it was desirable to restore that employment.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): Hear, hear!

Mr. ROBSON said he was grateful to the hon. Member for Sheffield for that affirmative expression of opinion, because he was trying to prove that this tax was protectionist. The object of this tax was to increase employment or rather to restore the lost employment of stripping the tobacco leaf. But even when the right hon. Gentleman arrived at this plain protectionist motive he still felt that he must inevitably seek for some excuse consistent with free-trade principles. So he would have the House believe that the differentiation which he sought to make between stripped tobacco and unstripped leaf was really in order to correct an anomaly which already existed in our Customs tariff. It appeared to be some mistake which he thought necessary to correct on the part of Mr. Gladstone. Mr. Gladstone apparently was protectionist. What was the only anomaly which could be perceived in connection with this differentiation of these two kinds of leaf? The stripped leaf which came into this country had some small additional value in consequence of the process being performed abroad. The difference in value between that and the unstripped leaf was something like 1½d. per lb. The right hon. Gentleman went on to explain that the revenue as well as the people suffered because there was no extra duty on the stripped leaf, but he did not tell the House one very important fact which might have materially qualified the argument he made use of in his Budget speech, which was that the importer of unstripped tobacco, if he stripped the tobacco, had the privilege of taking the stalks back to the Customs.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): I mentioned the drawback.

MR. ROBSON admitted that that was so, but the right hon. Gentleman then inferred that that would be a drawback on exports. The matter had now been put clearly before the House. The right hon. Gentleman had implied that the revenue had lost by not encouraging the importation of unstripped leaf. The precise words used were that the stalk would contain more matter and that therefore it would encourage industry if the leaf were brought in unstripped. The importer of unstripped leaf might go to the Customs and obtain a rebate of the duty, and that, therefore, the importers of stripped and unstripped leaf should be put in a position of equality. There was no information expressly given, or given at all, on the night of the introduction of the Budget. It only cost 1d. a lb., roughly speaking, to strip the leaf, and the right hon. Gentleman had put on a tax of 3d. a lb. That did not mean that he desired to correct an anomaly but that he desired to create a monopoly in this country for stripping the leaf. How did this protectionist tax work? It was a penal duty. It penalised the importer if he imported his raw material in this partly manufactured state. The operation of stripping was simple enough. It was simply drawing the stalk without, if possible, damaging the leaf, and it was an operation which was much better to perform when the leaf was fresh and had come to maturity, in the country where it was grown. In future this work was to be done here, where the operation could not be so efficiently performed. They were dealing with a new fiscal system. They would get more and more protection, the essence of which was that the work which had been hitherto done abroad should be done here.

What was the operation of this tax upon a manufacturer who did not want the stalk? The unstripped leaf which might be efficiently pulled out abroad was packed and sent across the Atlantic at extra cost and additional charges for freight; it was unpacked here and stripped and the stalks sent back to the Customs in order that a rebate of the duty might be obtained—and all these processes were gone through in order that the manufacturer might get something which he did not want and had no use for. Was that good business? It was protection, but was it sensible or sane business? And what was done with the stalk when obtained? The impression derived during the Budget speech was that it paid duty, but as a matter of fact the manufacturer was able to obtain a refund or rebate upon the stalk which he had imported. At the Customs House, however, fresh difficulties arose. The everlasting question of moisture cropped up, and the Customs House officials would not ordinarily give the refund upon the weight of the stalk. In order that it might be properly tested the stalk had to be ground to powder —which did not improve it even as offal—and then the manufacturer received a penny in addition to the 3s. per lb. duty. Until recently, this offal was thrown away as useless, but it was now used in connection with the extraction of pure nicotine, from which the Chancellor of the Exchequer derived no duty whatever. Could it be contended that the little benefit which accrued from the making of a by-product from this offal was any compensation for all the useless handling and freightage and inconvenience which he had described? If the offal was of value it would be important; but it was not, and the compensation derived from the offal manufacture was not commensurate with the cost of bringing it over.

The right hon. Gentleman had claimed that the tax would create employment. In one sense it would. An enormous amount of employment could be created by hampering great industries with futile and unprofitable processes; but it was the kind of employment of which the pauper's stone-heap was the popular type. The proposal would not increase general employment. The mistake of the protectionist lay in the assumption that when by some extravagant process he had given employment to one set of persons, he had thereby necessarily increased the employment of the community at large. To see whether this fiscal device had increased general employment, its effect upon the trade as a whole must be looked at. It increased the cost of manufacture by these useless processes, and, in so far as it encouraged the use of stalk where it was not used before, it lowered the quality of the tobacco. Moreover, as the cost was increased and the quality lowered, so more capital was called into the business, with the result that profits were diminished. That was the sort of increased employment to be secured from causes which checked consumption, diminished profits, and lowered wages! And that was the kind of increased employment by which the protectionist party were endeavouring to attract the English people to their fallacies.

Another very important view of the matter was that this impost was a differential tax. It differentiated between different kinds of the same raw material. Speaking generally, that was a novel principle. The English manufacturer, relying on our general fiscal system, had imported enormous quantities of stripped tobacco; he now found that it would pay him to go into the market and buy unstripped tobacco in order to strip it here. The result was an enormous appreciation of the value of existing stocks of unstripped tobacco, and a great depreciation of the value of other stocks. This money was put into the pockets of one section of the trade and taken out of the pockets of another. Under these circumstances it was only natural that different sections of the trade should have very different views about this tax. A question that ought not to be lost sight of was—who gained by this differential tax? Obviously the gainers were those persons who used stalk in the manufacture of their tobacco. The feature which protectionists thought so admirable about their system, viz., the imposition of taxes by which somebody gained, was to his mind the evil and curse of protection. The persons who gained by this particular tax were the importers of unstripped tobacco, such as Mr. Gallaher, the founder of the great limited company bearing his name. Which section of the trade had the right hon. Gentleman or his advisers consulted about this tax—the gainers or the losers? One naturally asked whether the Tariff Commission had been consulted. The Tariff Commission was formed for that very purpose, and this was the first opportunity it had had of entering into practical life. Upon that august body there was only one representative of the tobacco trade, and that was Mr. Gallaher himself. It would be interesting, therefore, to examine the views of Mr. Gallaher, because he was not acting secretly or furtively in this matter; he was acting as a statesman, a financier, the shadow behind the fiscal throne; and in the *Tobacco Weekly Journal* he had stated—

> "In the United States coloured people receive big wages for this work—the work of stripping—which, after all, might be done equally well in this country."

An HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. ROBSON said he was doubtful whether the hon. Member who interrupted him would cheer the next sentence—

> "In my evidence before a recent Committee I outlined this idea and my views were generally accepted."

This was the germ and the genesis of the new system of fiscal differentiation. Mr. Gallaher had already explained in an earlier part of the article that this was a wise Budget and that the poor man would not pay any more for his tobacco. Then he says—

> "If the independent manufacturers are squeezed out of the trade by the trust octopus I will take care that the British Government will become their own manufacturers, and then the profits will go in reduction of taxation instead of into the pockets of monopolists."

Mr. Gallaher said he would take care. He appeared to entertain an inflated or perhaps he ought to say an exalted view of his position and power as a Tariff Commissioner, and he seemed clearly to think that his suggestion, communicated no doubt through the proper channel to the Government, would have the greatest possible weight upon anything which referred to his own trade. He was a man of trade talking about his business, or matters intimately connected with his business, and it was hard to believe that such a man when he spoke of his influence with the Government was indulging in mere idle, insolent gasconade. What were the grounds on which Mr. Gallaher, as a Tariff Commissioner, thought he would be able to influence the Government? In the presence of a normal state of public affairs one would expect a rebuke to be administered to this Tariff Commissioner. If this Tariff Commissioner's evidence, given before the Committee which was formed for the purpose of advising the right hon. Gentleman, was the reason for the Budget in its present form of course the Chancellor of the Exchequer would not rebuke Mr. Gallaher, but it was necessary that the right hon. Gentleman should tell Mr. Gallaher that he must not give the thing away quite so completely. He thought differential taxation was mischievous, an evil, and a curse, and it was a most dangerous feature in English public life that they should have a great political Party forming a trade group interested in differential taxation, giving evidence before Departmental Committees, having the ear of members of the Government, swaggering about in all the borrowed plumes of a little unofficial position, and then boasting that they were able to influence the fiscal arrangements of this country and doing it in directions which gave them an unearned and an undeserved profit. How much further protectionist taxation and protectionist organisation might go he did not know, and he was not going to trouble the House with any speculations on the subject now, but he thought the House and the country would do well to watch this situation closely before allowing a Resolution of this kind to pass.

Mr. PARKER SMITH (Lanarkshire, Partick) said that in Scotland there was a sport called a "heresy hunt," which was indulged in by ministers and elders when they had reason to suspect persons of doctrines not strictly orthodox. Every action and every saying of the suspected person were scrutinised, and it was wonderful how heresy was extracted out of things absolutely innocent. The hon. and learned Gentleman opposite would display unrivalled capacities in such a hunt. In this particular instance the hon. and learned Member opposite had displayed a knowledge of the whole subject which he had not the slightest power of rivalling, and he had shown, in discussing this extremely technical subject, the power he claimed for himself as a lawyer to master other people's business. Of all the details of stripped and unstripped tobacco which the hon. and learned Member entered upon he had no knowledge at all, but the conclusion he had drawn was that the whole course of modern business showed what an enormous effect the very smallest interference with taxation might produce. The clumsy old protective duties of sixty years ago were now impossible and obsolete, but although taxation was such a tremendous engine of power it did not follow that the Government should always be wrong and stupid in the use of that engine. Because a powerful engine had been wrongly used, was that any reason why they should decline altogether to use it? The same argument would apply to all the latest scientific weapons of the day. They had recently seen that a ship might destroy itself by one of its own submarine mines, but was that any reason why a Navy should decline for ever to use mines to defend themselves? In this power they had a new and tremendous engine which other countries were able to use scientifically, and were not afraid of using. Undoubtedly this power might be used mistakenly, but Germany and America had developed themselves by the use of it at a rate which far outstripped the rate at which this country had developed. The hon. and learned Member talked of Mr. Gallaher, but he had not the slightest idea how this tax would help him, or Mr. Wills, or anybody else. That was not the business of the Government in considering a tax. The question the Government had to ask was whether it would benefit the country at large and not any particular individual. The hon. Member used the rather obsolete argument against protection that it could only benefit one particular class and could not benefit the country at large. Nobody would deny that it was wrong to use taxation in that way and nobody would think of defending such a course. Where a tariff was properly used in the development of the industries of a nation it was not one industry alone which benefited but the whole country. That had been the case in Germany and that was the whole reason and theory of the German scientific view that tariffs had been the most powerful engine in developing their country from the poor fragmentary set of scattered States producing only raw materials to its present position. That was the condition of Germany before List arose and preached a gospel as appropriate to Germany as the gospel of Cobden was appropriate at that time to the circumstances of this country. The position Germany then adopted was that they declined to be a country producing only raw material for other countries to work up. They declared that to develop their country it was necessary to have industries of their own.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis) asked if the hon. Member was in order in dealing with the taxes of Germany and America.

MR. PARKER SMITH said the hon. Member opposite had been allowed to raise the whole question as to whether these taxes involved protection, and so far as he dealt with that aspect of the question he presumed that he would be in order.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is in order in dealing with the question as to whether this is a protective tax or not, but he is not entitled to discuss the question of protection in regard to taxes upon all articles in all countries.

MR. PARKER SMITH said he apologised to the House for being led into these remarks, but they arose out of the speech of the hon. Member opposite. He would try to confine himself more to the particular question now before the House. The hon. Member had also attacked the tax on foreign cigars and cigarettes. There, he confessed, he was a little surprised at the hon. Member's argument because the attack mainly was that the tax was not sufficiently graduated as a luxury tax. Supposing it was a tax on foreign cigars and cigarettes, he did not think the hon. Member attempted to argue that, looked at as a purely luxury tax, it was in any way unfair or too heavy. His objection to it was that it did not bring in a sufficient amount to make it worth while to collect. Whether it would be sufficient to have the effect of causing more cigars and cigarettes to be made in England than would have been made if it had not been imposed he did not know. But suppose that it brought more trade to the manufacturers of cigars and cigarettes in England, he held that would be an advantage. It might be—and in all probability would be—an advantage not merely to the people who made English cigars and cigarettes, but to the whole country, for in this small industry it meant a greater amount of employment in England. It was an advantage to have the article made in England even if there was a slight increase in the cost for the same class of cigar when made here, as compared with the price when the cigar was made in Germany.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): Advantage to whom?

MR. PARKER SMITH: Advantage to the country. Not an advantage merely to the man who made the cigar, but an advantage to the country at large.

MR. LOUGH: Not to the man who smokes it.

MR. PARKER SMITH said he hoped there would not be sufficient difference in the quality of the cigar to interfere with the health of the gentleman who smoked it. If the cigar were made here we would have the advantage of the wages paid in England, whereas if the cigar were imported from Germany the whole of the wages and the profit went to the German makers. He knew the reply to that would be that if the cigar were made in Germany a biscuit would have to be imported by Germany in order to pay for the cigar. Of course, that was the ordinary free-trade reply. But that reply was based on an absolute fallacy. That reply failed altogether to see that the same biscuit had to be made and given to the cigar maker here in England. The biscuit maker did not lose his trade because the cigar was made in England. He was afraid he was entering rather too much into a lecture upon political economy. He was perfectly certain that this aspect of the question of foreign trade was not sufficiently understood by gentlemen whose studies of political economy were generally confined to a limited number of phrases and elementary matters which appeared in the works of economists, where they were largely qualified. Even in the orthodox works there were qualifications which did not appear in the ordinary political speech either in this House or on the platform. These were the general foreign, Continental, and American views as opposed to a school which everyone would say was an insular school. That school had ceased altogether to have any power abroad, whereas the other school—the modern school of national economy as against individualistic economy—was getting more and more accepted. He hoped this House and the country would get to understand that school more and more. He was confident that when those views were more understood by hon. Members they would not be content to appeal to a phrase as the final arbiter of practical action. These views had the support not of those simply who were concerned in their own selfish interests. Hon. Members cheered as if they thought that men who took a different view of political economy from themselves were the only men who had selfish motives. He could assure hon. Members that it was nothing of the kind. He had not sufficient acquaintance with the intricacies of the duty on cigars and cigarettes to say whether it was a protective tax or not, but assuming that the hon. Member opposite was correct in what he said, then it was possible and probable that the effect of such a tax might be entirely for the good of the country at large.

*SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston) said he would not follow the hon. Member into what he called the general "foreign, Continental, and American" political economy. He congratulated him on having stated at the conclusion of his speech that he did not enter into, or refer to, the protective character of the tax now before the House. But he himself would like to refer to that, because in various quarters the speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer was referred to in very different terms. It was called a free-trade Budget by some, but by most people it was said to have a whiff of protection in it, and that suggested to his mind that it might be found in the luxury tax on cigars and cigarettes. He put a Question to the Chancellor of the Exchequer in order to find out what was the total consumption of foreign cigarettes in this country. The Chancellor of the Exchequer informed him that 510,965lbs. represented the foreign cigarettes consumed annually. That weight did not form a very large amount on which to raise revenue for the relief of taxation under present circumstances, and he naturally began to wonder whether there was anything else at the back of this particular form of taxation, for, after all, supposing the consumption kept up, and that Egypt and Turkey, which chiefly sent cigarettes, sent us 510,965lbs. every year, the total amount the Chancellor of the Exchequer would get would be some £25,000. The right hon. Gentleman to-day admitted that he expected to get only £20,000, showing that the first effect, at all events, would be a probable reduction in the consumption of foreign-made cigarettes. It seemed to him that the alteration of the tax on articles like cigarettes for the purpose of adding so insignificant a sum to the Exchequer was an unwarrantable alteration of the existing duty, especially when they knew from recent circumstances that the existing duty had been strong enough to keep American cigarettes largely out of the country. It came to this, that if the tax was only to raise £20,000 it was not of much use for revenue purposes. It was a small sum, he might say a paltry sum, to justify the infliction of a new tax or burden on the tobacco trade. It was causing disturbance of the whole trade by the issue of new price lists, and difficulties of that kind. Assuming it would have a similar effect to other taxes, the effect would be to put up the price of the home-made article in consequence of the extra protection granted against the foreign article.

When he came to consider the amount of the home-made article as compared with the foreign-made article a glimmer of light was got as to the effect on the trade of the country at large. The Chancellor of the Exchequer was not able to give him any statistics as to the amount of cigarettes manufactured in this country, but other people were not in that position. Certain organs more or less connected with the trade had estimated the home manufacture of cigarettes at from 90 to 95 per cent. of the total consumption. Taking the figures at 95 per cent. there would be a total consumption of 10,000,000lbs. a year, an estimate which he did not think excessive considering the enormous number of cigarette smokers, and the deplorable increase of the habit amongst young people who bought 1d. packets. There was evidence already that the tax had had the effect of increasing the price of the home-manufactured cigarettes. A circular had been issued to the trade saying that packets of 100 cigarettes would be charged 3d. more, which practically meant 1s. per lb. on British-made cigarettes. In another case an addition of 3d. had been mentioned by the *Financial Times* as being charged on tins of fifty cigarettes. In reference to the packets of five cigarettes which were sold at a penny with a tube—which was a good point because the tube made them less dangerous smoking to young people—these packets were sold by the trade in boxes containing 1,000, which weighed 2lbs of tobacco. But in some cases these 1d. packets were already charged more to the retailer; and in other cases where the packets contained ten cigarettes, the price had gone up 1d. There had been a change of ½d. a packet in the price of American-made cigarettes—those known as Richmond Gems. What would be the result if only 1s. duty was used to increase the price of the home-made article as against the foreign-made article? Taking the lowest estimate that 90 per cent. of the total consumption of cigarettes is manufactured in these islands; that would leave 10 per cent. for the foreign-made article. Then, in order that the Chancellor of the Exchequer might get £20,000 or at most £25,000, somebody would have to pay some £225,000 additional for the cigarettes, and of that sum the greater part would go into the pockets of the home manufacturers, though perhaps a small part would be taken out of the pockets not of the consumers but of the retailers. But if only 5 per cent. of the total consumption was foreign-made, and 95 per cent. home-made, there was the startling fact that £475,000 would be lost to the people of this country through the imposition of a tax which brought into the Exchequer the paltry sum of £20,000. These figures had been worked out most carefully; and he ventured to bring before the House the fact that this tax of 1s. per lb. on foreign-made cigarettes had all the worst elements of a protective duty, because it punished the people and did very little good to the Exchequer. He believed that this tax was as bad and cruel as any tax could be.

His hon. and learned friend behind him had shown very admirably that the differentiating tax on stripped and unstripped tobacco had a similar effect in punishing the people of this country, but the difference on cigarettes was still greater. He wished the Chancellor of the Exchequer could reassure the House that that was not so; that the evil was not so great as was suspected at present. Moreover, he considered this tax was unnecessary, because the trade did not require any protection. It was not long since they saw in the newspapers a report of a case in the Law Courts which gave an inkling of the enormous profits made by certain large tobacco firms. It was shown that a bonus had been offered to the retailers amounting to hundreds of thousands of pounds. A trade which was in a position of that kind did not want any extra help from this House to put additional profits into their pockets. Further, they learned that the ordinary 10d. duty which existed between manufactured cigarettes and the ordinary manufactured tobacco was quite sufficient to prevent the invasion into this country from America. When the American Tobacco Combine attempted to gain the monopoly of the tobacco trade in this country that 10d. duty was quite sufficient to give the home manufacturers the advantage by which they were able to resist the capture of their trade. The tax was unnecessary, and the evil of it was in no sense mitigated by the advantage given to the trade in this country as opposed to the foreign trade. He should be glad of anything which would operate to check the evil of cigarette-smoking by lads, but such a tax he wished to be one which should go at once into the Exchequer. If he could see £250,000 going into the Exchequer as the result of this tax he should welcome it as a useful and beneficial means of raising revenue for national purposes. They had on the contrary a tax which would bring an exiguous amount into the Exchequer, and take an enormous sum from the pockets of the public. Therefore he thought it was an evil tax which should be resisted. Now, when they wanted national efficiency and economy—which he believed were the same thing—they should look very narrowly into these attempts at taxation which would do injury to the people at large and yield a comparatively small benefit to the revenue of the nation.

Question put.

Mr. McKENNA (Monmouthshire, N.) said he was astonished that the House had not had an answer from the Chancellor of the Exchequer to the speech made by his hon. and learned friend who opened this debate.

The PRIME MINISTER and FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.); We can only speak once in this debate.

Mr. McKENNA: The Question was at that moment being put without the House having had the advantage of hearing the Chancellor of the Exchequer at all. His hon. friend stated that this new tariff would be of advantage to a particular member of the tobacco trade, and that particular member of the tobacco trade happened to be a member of the Tariff Commission. Now, it might be said that it was a far cry from the Chancellor of the Exchequer to the Tariff Commission, and that many steps would have to be taken before there could be proved an immediate connection between the action of the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the views of the Tariff Commission. But anticipating that answer he had looked up that morning a speech made by the late Colonial Secretary in his opening address on the constitution of the Tariff Commission. The late Colonial Secretary said—

> "Now, gentlemen, it would be premature for me to anticipate the result of this great Commission. All I will say is this—if we are successful, as I believe we shall be, in introducing a tariff which will have fully taken into account all the various interests concerned, and which will generally approve itself to those interested, although even then we shall not have made law—we shall have done a great service to our law-givers, and we shall have paved the way, at any rate, for the immediate realisation of any mandate with which the country may ultimately be pleased to entrust us."

It might be said that the present Chancellor of the Exchequer had no mandate to act on the recommendations of the Tariff Commission, but neither had the First Lord of the Treasury a mandate to permit of the introduction of protectionist legislation at all. Further, not only had the right hon. Gentleman not had a mandate, but he gave the House and the country a distinct pledge that until after a general election and until he had a majority of the electorate behind him, he would not introduce into the House or be responsible for protectionist legislation.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said he never said he would be responsible at any time.

Mr. McKENNA said he did not say that the right hon. Gentleman said he would be responsible at any time. What the right hon. Gentleman said was that he would not be responsible. As his hon. and learned friend had shown it was not denied, it could not be denied or contradicted, that this was protectionist legislation. It was introduced by the Chancellor of the Exchequer on protectionist grounds. The right hon. Gentleman in his original speech omitted to inform the House that a rebate was given on the stalk when returned to the Customs House; but now that they knew that to be the case it was only in accordance with the ordinary Customs regulations that the duty on stripped and unstripped tobacco leaf should be exactly the same. The proposal was made by the Chancellor of the Exchequer for the express purpose of restoring to this country an industry, and in order to give workers in this country an advantage in the stripping of the tobacco leaf. What the value of that work was could be judged by the fact that it was now carried on exclusively by negro labour, and was paid for at the very cheapest rates. If workpeople in this country were to enter into competition with the foreign stripper they would have to be content with very nearly the level of the wages paid to negroes in the United States. One of the gentlemen who advised the Chancellor of the Exchequer recently on this subject went so far as to suggest that if this trade were to be carried on successfully in this country the Government would have to introduce Chinese labour. The Chancellor of the Exchequer said that in the five years from 1860–64 only 43 per cent. of the tobacco entering this country was stripped before importation, but that last year no less than 77 per cent. had undergone that process before being brought into this country. That was to say, that the Customs regulations had actually driven employment out of the country. The same duty was put on stripped and unstripped tobacco, and a rebate was allowed on the full weight of the stems taken back to the Customs House. If there was a slight difference between the two owing to the greater amount of water in the stem, that could be remedied by an alteration of the rebate. But what the Chancellor of the Exchequer did was to put an extra duty of 3d. on the stripped tobacco in order to carry out his declared object of giving employment in this country in the process of stripping. As his hon. friend had shown, that was protection, and indeed the only hon. Gentleman who had spoken in defence of the Chancellor of the Exchequer's proposal defended it on protectionist grounds. He indulged in a protectionist homily, and his only argument was that it was a protective duty which would be of benefit to the country as a whole.

His hon. friend spoke of Mr. Gallaher's position on the Tariff Commission. There was another point to be raised in regard to this taxation, which was not a pleasant point. The secret of what the Budget was going to be was usually very well kept. It was a matter of great pride that individual traders had not the opportunity of anticipating the proposals of the Budget and making profits by bringing in goods beforehand. But anyone who took the trouble to look up the March figures for the imports of tobacco would discover a remarkable fact. The imports in March, 1903, of stripped tobacco amounted to 3,622,000lbs. and in March, 1904, to 3,441,000lbs., being a slight decrease. The imports of unstripped tobacco in March, 1903, was 2,063,000lbs., but in March, 1904, the import amounted to 4,622,000lbs., so that some fortunate person was able to anticipate the secret that by a 3d. duty on stripped tobacco and not on unstripped tobacco a fortune was to be made if only before the Budget was introduced unstripped tobacco could be brought into the country. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had stated that of the raw tobacco imported 77 per cent. was unstripped and 23 per cent. stripped, but in March, 1904, the stripped tobacco imported amounted to 3,400,000lbs. and the unstripped tobacco to 4,600,000lbs. The percentage was no longer in favour of the stripped tobacco, and one could only assume that the unstripped tobacco was brought in in anticipation of some such proposal as this. They were justified in asking who it was who advised the Chancellor of the Exchequer. Was he advised by persons interested in bringing in unstripped tobacco? Was he advised by the Tariff Commission? There was no shadow of a suggestion, and he hoped it would not be stated hereafter that there was, that the Chancellor of the Exchequer was in any way acting in complicity with anyone in this matter. He hoped no one would hereafter quote the phrase, "Willing to wound yet afraid to strike." No one could say he was saying anything by insinuation which he dared not say outright. What he asked was, Had the Chancellor of the Exchequer been made a dupe? Was it merely an accident that in March of this year the imports of unstripped tobacco should have exceeded all the imports heretofore? It was not because of home consumption that there were such heavy imports in March. The home consumption of tobacco in March, 1903, was 1.553,000lbs., and in March, 1904, 1,554,000lbs. The home consumption was absolutely normal, and yet they had a gigantic increase in the imports. If it were the fact that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had anticipated the mandate and had acted on the principle laid down by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham in his opening address to the Tariff Commission, if he went to the Tariff Commission for advice, and if the only representative of the tobacco trade on the Tariff Commission, either himself or through others, recommended this tax to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the House had a right to know it.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said that the hon. Gentleman was insinuating a very grave charge. He thought he was entitled to ask that the hon. Member should formulate it in express terms, and then he should be in a position to answer it. Did the hon. Member insinuate that he had given information, direct or indirect?

Mr. McKENNA said he wished to insinuate nothing.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN asked if the hon. Member would formulate the charge?

Mr. McKENNA said he thought he did that thoroughly. There was no question of the hon. Gentleman's guilt or innocence in this matter. No one supposed that he was anything but a perfectly honourable man. The question was—was he a dupe? He stated the facts as they were to be found in the public records, and showed that the imports in March of unstripped tobacco were excessive. He trusted the right hon. Gentleman would not talk about insinuations.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN asked what conclusion did the hon. Member wish the House to draw.

Mr. McKENNA said that he stated the facts. He knew this fact—that Mr. Gallaher was the largest owner of stocks of unstripped tobacco; and also that he was a member of the Tariff Reform Commission. He also knew that the right hon. Gentleman opposite stated in his opening address to the Tariff Commission that, though they were not law-givers, they would be able to do "a great service to our law-givers." He wanted to know whether the great service had been done to our law-givers at this moment by the Tariff Commission, and in particular by Mr. Gallaher, the only representative of the tobacco trade upon that Commission, and if not by Mr. Gallaher himself, who the advisers of the right hon. Gentleman had been, in order that they might judge whether there had been any connection, direct or indirect, between the Chancellor of the Exchequer of to-day and the Tariff Commission of to-day, it being an accepted principle of the protectionist party opposite that the Chancellor of the Exchequer of the future should have direct communication with the Tariff Commission of the future.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The hon. Member has stated as a fact that Mr. Gallaher has imported an exceptional quantity of whole leaf tobacco.

Mr. McKENNA: I never suggested that.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: May I ask the hon. Gentleman a question? Do I rightly understand him to suggest that Mr. Gallaher has imported an exceptional quantity of whole leaf tobacco, and, having obtained that tobacco in this country, has been my adviser in urging me to make a change which was for his benefit? Is that what the hon. Gentleman suggests, and, if not, may I ask him not to repeat the various insinuations which he has already been making, for that is unnecessary, but to state exactly what is the conclusion that he wishes the House to draw?

Mr. McKENNA said they had not nearly reached the stage of conclusions yet. They appealed to the responsible Ministers to give them information before they drew their conclusions. He showed a *primâ facie* case that some one anticipated correctly what the Budget proposals were going to be. As to who it was that anticipated them he did not know; but he did know that Mr. Gallaher was a member of the Tariff Commission, and that he had informed the public and the world at large that the Committee had accepted his views and that he approved of the Budget, and he knew also, on the authority of the Tariff Commission and its founder, that although the members of that Commission were not law-givers they were very near it, that if not they very soon would be.

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN (Birmingham, W.): I should like to ask the hon. Gentleman, as he refused to give the Chancellor of the Exchequer the satisfaction which I think my right hon. friend is entitled to ask, whether he will explain a little more fully his insinuations against me. Does he mean to insinuate that in saying, what was perfectly a matter of course, that an important representative commercial Commission would have great influence with our future law-givers in any recommendations they might make in reference to the tariff, does he mean to insinuate that in saying that, in making that general remark in a public statement, I was suggesting to the members of the Tariff Commission that they should improperly use their position in order to advise the Chancellor of the Exchequer to alter the taxation of the country for their benefit, and if he does not mean that, what on earth does he mean?

Mr. McKENNA said that the right hon. Gentleman's intellect was far too subtle for him. He meant nothing of the sort. The right hon. Gentleman had really very little to do with this matter.

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Then why did the hon. Member drag me in?

Mr. McKENNA said that he quoted the right hon. Gentleman because he had reason to refer to the Tariff Commission and its objects, and those objects as stated very plainly on the authority of its founder. He found that Mr. Gallaher, of the Tariff Commission, had made recommendations which had proved——

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN: How do you know?

Mr. McKENNA said that Mr. Gallaher had stated so in the *Tobacco Weekly Journal*.

Mr. J. **Chamberlain** again rose but Mr. **McKenna** declined to give way and both remained standing, amid cheers and counter cheers, and loud cries of "Order." Finally Mr. J. **Chamberlain** resumed his seat.

Mr. McKENNA, continuing, said that Mr. Gallaher's words were—

> "In my evidence before a recent Committee I outlined this idea, and my views were generally accepted."

Mr. HARRIS (Tynemouth): Might I interrupt the hon. Gentleman to say that Mr. Gallaher has given no evidence before the Commission?

Mr. McKENNA: It was a Departmental Committee.

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN: What has the Tariff Commission to do with it?

Mr. McKENNA said that Mr. Gallaher had given evidence before a Departmental Committee which advised the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

Mr. **Harris** rose once more amid loud Opposition cries of "Order," but as Mr. **McKenna** refused to give way he resumed his seat.

Mr. McKENNA said that Mr. Gallaher's statement was—

> "In my evidence before a recent Committee I outlined this idea, and my views were generally accepted."

Here they found the work of the Tariff Commission being done.

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN: What has it to do with the Tariff Commission?

Mr. McKENNA said Mr. Gallaher, the only representative of the trade on the Commission, gave his evidence before a Departmental Committee; the ideas which he outlined were generally accepted; and as a result, he supposed, or at any rate partly as a result, a proposal was introduced by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. That proposal they now found was good for British industry, but not for British industry as a whole, but for a part of it; and it happened to be, as he was informed, that part of the industry in which Mr. Gallaher was himself interested. Those were the facts, bare and simple, so far as they knew them at present. It remained with the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who did not take the opportunity earlier, to explain what all the facts might be. He might have a complete explanation which the House would hear, but the fact stood undoubted that this was a protective proposal now. When it was first introduced he was under the impression from the right hon. Gentleman's speech that it was a purely free-trade proposal, and that he was remedying an existing evil in our Customs regulations. The right hon. Gentleman did not mention at the time that a rebate was given on the stalk when it was taken back to the Customs House. They now knew that a rebate was given, and in consequence this was a protective tax. He asked the Prime Minister whether, after his pledge that nothing should be done contrary to the ancient fiscal policy of this country until after a general election, he now proposed to go on with this proposal.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The speech of the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down is happily of a kind to which we are not often accustomed to listen in this House, and is one which I venture to say, if it reflects discredit upon anyone, reflects discredit on the maker rather than on the persons at whom it is aimed. The hon. Gentleman has thought fit to insinuate repeatedly and persistently charges of what would be dishonest conduct. [Cries of "No."] Yes, of dishonest conduct—if not of absolute fraud against certain persons. I asked him whether his charges were directed against me. He said "No." He then branched off to the Tariff Commission. My right hon. friend invited him to condescend to particulars. He again refused to make clear what he did not hesitate to insinuate. I asked him whether Mr. Gallaher, whose name he introduced so freely into this discussion, was the person to whom he imputed this improper conduct. Again the hon. Member, who does not hesitate to make an imputation, refused, when he was challenged, to take the responsibility of his statement. I do not propose to follow the hon. Gentleman into the line of conduct which he has thought it decent to pursue. He has been making inquiries amongst traders. He has been supplied with his information, he admits, by traders who consider themselves adversely affected. It is very natural that anyone who thinks himself adversely affected in a matter of this kind should approach a Member of Parliament to get his case stated, but the hon. Member is no more entitled to make the insinuations he did against me or those who have advised me than I am entitled to impute improper motives to him in the course he has taken. I think it is better to treat the matter on its merits. [OPPOSITION Cheers.] I am glad that hon. Gentlemen opposite recognise the advantage of that course now that I suggest it. I think it will be better to treat the matter on its merits and make a simple statement of the case before the House.

There are two branches of this subject involved in the changes which I have proposed in the tobacco duties. There is first the additional duty on imported cigars and cigarettes, and secondly, the additional duty on stripped tobacco. I will deal first with the additional duty on cigars and cigarettes. The hon. and learned Gentleman who opened the discussion to-day said that my proposal for an additional duty, unaccompanied by an Excise, upon an imported article of luxury was a novelty in our fiscal system. He is quite mistaken. He has taken a great deal of trouble to study this subject, but he really has not mastered it, I am afraid. He appears to be utterly unaware that what I am proposing is a mere extension of what my right hon. friend the Member for West Bristol did on two occasions without, so far as I am aware, raising in the breast of the strictest free-trader any anxiety. We have had exactly this kind of duty on cigars for several years past. I do not think anybody has been the worse for it, and the Revenue has been somewhat better. It is quite true of my right hon. friend's luxury tax on cigars, as it is true of the addition I make to that tax and the similar tax I propose on imported cigarettes, that it may conceivably have some slight protective effect. That is not my object in proposing it, any more than it was the object of my right hon. friend the Member for West Bristol. Our object was to get revenue. I think there is no more suitable object for the activity of a Chancellor of the Exchequer in search of revenue than cigars and cigarettes. So far we all go together. Then am I to be debarred from raising more revenue on imported cigars and cigarettes because, owing to administrative difficulties, I cannot exactly proportion a corresponding Excise upon home-manufactured cigars and cigarettes? I say it is driving our fiscal principles to a point which is little removed from the ludicrous if I am not to impose a tax which is harmless in itself, which will add something to the Revenue, which affects an article of luxury, and which will be no burden to anyone who pays it because, conceivably, somebody at home may slightly benefit from our procedure.

The hon. Member for Ilkeston pursued an ingenious argument on the most orthodox lines to show that as, according to his calculation, only 5 per cent. of our total consumption of cigarettes was imported, and 95 per cent., or thereabouts, was made in this country, in endeavouring to raise some revenue from the imported cigarettes I should raise the cost of the whole of the home-manufactured cigarettes. He put it into figures. For the sake of obtaining £20,000 upon these imported cigarettes, he said I was going to raise from the consumers of home-made cigarettes in this country a sum which he gave as from £220,000 to £250,000 a year. I really think the hon. Gentleman had better put himself in communication with the great cigarette manufacturers in this country and explain to them the process which will enable them to pocket this enormous sum. They cannot do anything of the kind; competition is too keen to allow it. When the hon. Gentleman said that the price of some of these cigarettes had already been raised, he assumed that that was so in consequence of the duty on imported cigarettes. He should consult the cigarette makers. They would tell him quite a different tale. They would tell him they have raised their price to compensate themselves for the additional duty which I have put upon stripped tobacco. None of them thinks he can raise the price of five-a-penny cigarettes to the public because I have put an additional duty of 1s. a pound on imported cigarettes. It is quite true that the sum which I raise by these two taxes is not very large. Every Chancellor of the Exchequer knows that when he proposes a new tax he has a good deal of opposition to meet, and he is not infrequently deterred from making small adjustments, however desirable in themselves, because he does not consider that the gain in revenue would compensate him for the Parliamentary opposition which he would meet. I thought, however, that it was worth while to impose this tax and take the revenue we can get from it. I have been constantly asked why I did not put a tax on articles of luxury instead of taxing the poor man's tea. I wonder how many of my critics have taken the trouble to consider what article of luxury not now taxed we might put a tax on that would not be open to exactly the same criticism which is brought against my proposal. It is a curious fact that just those gentlemen who are most adverse to any change in our fiscal system express the loudest disappointment that the Chancellor of the Exchequer has not made a new fiscal heaven and a new fiscal earth. If you wish to be bound, as for the present I am bound, by all the rules that have guided us in the past, you cannot devise these ingenious taxes on luxury which are to enable you to relieve the burden on the poorer classes.

I turn to the question of "strips." When the Chancellor of the Exchequer is thinking of imposing new taxation he is always under great difficulties in the matter of making inquiries. If he goes to any member of a trade concerned and begins to inquire into its nature and circumstances, the trader takes alarm, and at once clears as much as he can of the article to which the inquiries refer. I therefore made no inquiries of any member of the trade with reference to my Budget. I acted wholly upon the information which was in the possession of the Revenue Departments and the Treasury. The hon. Gentleman who spoke last suggested that Mr. Gallaher either obtained information directly or indirectly from me or some of those who advised me, or that he himself advised me to impose this tax and took advantage of what he knew was going to be done to import an exceptional quantity of whole leaf tobacco.

MR. McKENNA: I never said that.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The hon. Gentleman did not say that, because he said nothing frankly. If he did not mean that, he meant nothing. In either case I am content to leave him to the judgment of the House. I have seen one communication from Mr. Gallaher. It is a communication made to me since my Budget statement. It was sent to the Chairman of the Board of Inland Revenue, and was to the effect that he thought I had made a mistake in these proposals, and that if I had read his evidence before the Committee to which the hon. Gentleman refers I should not have suggested them to the House. The letter was a private letter to the Chairman of the Board of Inland Revenue, which he desired the Chairman to show me in order to warn me. I hope he will not think I have done wrong in referring to it in public; but when insinuations of bad faith were made, it seemed the least I could do in justice to Mr. Gallaher and myself to state the nature of the only communication of any kind I have had with him in connection with this matter.

What was this proposal? The hon. and learned Gentleman detects in it an ingenious attempt to prepare the way for great fiscal changes or to lead the House along paths they would not with their eyes open be willing to tread. He says this is scientific taxation. I wish my critics would agree among themselves. On the first night of this debate the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition referred to my Budget statement with great kindness and generosity, and assured the Committee that although he had watched most narrowly he detected nothing of a suspicious nature, unless it might be one phrase, in the whole of my long remarks. My hon. friend the Member for Durham, who will not be suspected of any undue sympathy with my supposed fiscal views, told the Committee that this Budget was a very good free-trade Budget, and that there was not a whiff of protection about it.

Mr. ELLIOT (Durham): The expression was first used by my hon. friend opposite, the late Under-Secretary for the Colonies. I afterwards said, thinking the phrase rather a happy one, that, barring some small whiff of protection, this was a very good free-trade Budget.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The hon. Gentleman congratulated himself that there was no scientific taxation about it. That may be a merit or a demerit; but I believe it is true. I have trodden the old path, and have produced what my critics call a humdrum Budget. I had to obtain money, and I looked about to see how I could do it. One of the possible sources of revenue was a general rise in the tax upon tobacco. I satisfied myself from the best information that was available that such a rise as would produce the whole sum I wanted from indirect taxation would undoubtedly check consumption, and would therefore fail to produce the sum required. In the course of these inquiries my attention was called to a gap in our duties on tobacco; that gap I propose to fill, and out of it—after making certain allowances to the trade for which they have been long asking—to bring the sum of £500,000 to the Revenue. The hon. and learned Gentleman said that I made no reference in my Budget speech to the effect which the granting of a drawback on the stalks or offal has upon this question, but he evidently forgets what I did say. I did not go into the subject at very great length, because it is such a very technical question, but I dealt with the question at sufficient length to show every man connected with the trade what I was talking about, and that was my object when I referred to the subject of a drawback. The position is this. We impose a certain tax on raw tobacco, with a correlative but increased rate on the manufactured article in each of its various stages. But the first process of manufacture, that is the treatment of the leaf, is allowed to come into this country without any corresponding rate in our scale of duties. That anomaly I remove by the duty on stripped tobacco before importation.

The hon. and learned Member for South Shields says that I differentiate between two kinds of tobacco. He is begging the whole question. Tobacco that is stripped is not raw material. It is tobacco that is partly manufactured. The hon. and learned Gentleman appears to think that the stripping of tobacco is a simple and easy task best performed in the country of origin, and naturally performed there; and that it would be no benefit to the consumer or to the trade to transfer that process to this country. I traverse that statement and every statement he made in that connection. Stripping tobacco is skilled labour, and it is not the simple and easy task that the hon. Member supposes. My evidence leads me to believe that the hon. Member has grossly understated the cost of that process. It is not best performed in the country of origin, and in the case of tobacco for the English market this process is not performed in the country of origin, and even in the case of tobacco for the English market it is to a large extent performed on the Continent, where the tobacco is taken in the whole leaf and then stripped for exportation to this country. I have had brought to my notice the evidence of the people engaged in this trade in Holland. They were considering a proposed alteration in their own Customs duties and pointing out the large employment which this stripping of the whole tobacco leaf for the English market gave to their countrymen in the agricultural districts, especially when agricultural work was slack; they protested against any change in the Customs duties which would injuriously affect this lucrative business. Some of the stripping is also done in this country. The hon. and learned Member for South Shields seems to think it is work unfit for white labour. If he will look at Mr. Booth's great book on "Life and Labour in London," he will find that Mr. Booth expresses his pleasure and surprise at finding in this industry an employment which pays good wages and affords a pleasant contrast to so many of the industries of the East-End.

I do not say it would be right to attempt to bring back to this country, by the agency of our fiscal system, employment which by natural causes has been diverted elsewhere. At any rate such an object is outside the scope of the fiscal system which we have adopted for this country. But I do say that no one who has ever had to deal with our fiscal system in the past intended that our duties should be so drawn as to make trade vary its natural course, and prevent work being done here which would be done here if trade could follow its natural course. Yet that is the position at the present time. This trade might naturally be done here—in fact a great part of it is done here now—but a much larger part would be done here were it not that our duties were so constructed as to penalise any manufacturer who attempted to perform that portion of the work in this country. A greater part of this work of stripping the whole leaf would be done here than is done here were it not for that anomaly in our duties to which I have referred, and which I propose to remove by the new duty on imported stripped tobacco. This is quite evident from the figures I have given to the Committee and which I need not now repeat as to the increasing proportion which the importation of stripped tobacco bears to our total importation of tobacco and the decrease in the importation of the whole leaf. I have further evidence upon this point from tobacconists, merchants, and manufacturers, to the effect that within quite recent times they had seen particular kinds of leaf imported into this country in strips which had never been imported in strips before, and I think I could prove to the House if it were necessary that not only is that contrary to the natural course of trade but it is bad for the quality of the article itself. The hon. and learned Member for South Shields, speaking on far too limited information, said that doing this work in this country was much more likely to injure the leaf than when it was done abroad. The hon. and learned Member is apparently not aware that the major portion of the leaf which comes unstripped into this country is so imported because to bring it in in any other form would injure the leaf. Manufacturers are bound to import the leaf in the unstripped condition to preserve its quality. Indeed, I am informed that there are some kinds of tobacco which manufacturers would wish to use in this country, but which they will not use because they cannot afford to import it in the whole leaf, and it would not stand carriage in any other shape or form. Apart from the present fiscal controversy, I think the hon. and learned Member ought to have considered this problem in a calm and reasonable light without allowing the balance of his judgment to be upset by fancy bogeys. Let not the House suppose that I have invented a distinction between the whole leaf and the stripped leaf which is unknown to the trade at home or to the Customs duties of other countries. Every country distinguishes between the whole leaf and the stripped leaf, and our own Customs Returns have distinguished between them from the earliest days, except for a period of eleven years when the distinction was omitted. These are perfectly distinct and well understood terms, and there is no justification on the principles on which our tobacco duties are founded for omitting to have a correlative rate for the first process as you have a correlative rate for every other process. You might just as well say that it is wrong to have a special rate for cigars as apart from tobacco, or for Cavendish as apart from the raw leaf, as it is to have a special rate for strips as apart from the raw leaf.

Looked at from the point of view of what would be a right tariff there were only two alternatives open to me. I might lower the duty on the whole leaf, or raise the duty on the stripped leaf. If I had money to give away I would have lowered the duty on the whole leaf. I had no money to give away, but I wanted some, and I raised it by the duty on stripped tobacco. Opinion as to the effect of the duty on the relative values of stripped tobacco and whole leaf in bond or in the market is very conflicting. The tobacco manufacturers tell me, and I believe tell me truly, that for something like a year or over they will not be able to find a sufficient supply of the whole leaf in the market. That, indeed, is the reason why I feel confident I shall get the revenue which I anticipate from the duty. The hon. and learned Member for South Shields tells me that the holders of the stocks of strips will have to bear all the burden. I wish hon. Members opposite would make up their minds on whom the duty would really fall—on the holders of strips as the representatives of the twenty firms which waited on me the other day said it would fall, or on the poor working men, for whom hon. Members opposite have not said much to-day, but for whom they are expressing such sympathy in the constituencies. In my opinion, though there has been considerable momentary disturbance, as was inevitable in such a case, there will be nothing like the disturbance between the stripped leaf and the whole leaf which is anticipated. I think they will be able to work off their stock without much difficulty, and in any case I am happy to know that a very large proportion of the stocks in this country are after all only held on commission, and the importers themselves are not the real owners of the stocks.

I do not know that it is possible to work out an exact scientific adjustment between the value of the stripped and the value of the whole leaf, and to make that exactly correlative to the rate of duty. Does the hon. Gentleman who complained of my addition to the rate on stripped suppose that the rates imposed by Mr. Gladstone on other classes of tobacco are exactly correlative? At every stage of manufacture except the first stage I say without hesitation that the British manufacturer is protected, and has been protected for forty years. He had his protection established by Mr. Gladstone, he has been left protected by every Liberal Chancellor of the Exchequer, and no man has found anything contrary to his fiscal conscience in this arrangement until I proposed something which fills in an admitted gap and makes it possible to do a portion of the work in this country which our fiscal system has hitherto made it impossible to do. The duty I propose on stripped tobacco bears a fair proportion to the duties on the other kinds of manufactured tobacco. It takes its proper place in the scale. It will give a revenue, after making allowance for concessions in respect of moisture and drawback, of something like £500,000 this year, and it will raise it with less hardship to any individuals in this country than any other method that can be conceived. I venture to say, therefore, that hon. Gentlemen are driving their suspicion of the ultimate designs of the present Chancellor of the Exchequer to an extreme point when they refuse to make so reasonable and legitimate an adjustment and extension of our existing duties at a time when increased revenue is so urgently needed.

LORD HUGH CECIL (Greenwich) said he had listened with much regret to the speech of the hon. Member for North Monmouth. He did not think the hon. Member quite appreciated his responsibility in making that sort of speech. Supposing, for example, he had in his mind another explanation, such as the indiscretion of an official, his proper course would have been not to raise the matter publicly, but to write privately to the Chancellor of the Exchequer to draw his attention to the matter, who, being, on his own hypothesis, a man of scrupulous honour, would have been anxious to trace the matter out. But by drawing public attention to it the hon. Gentleman, however much he might disclaim intention for himself, put into the hands of other people, speaking at some unreported meeting or issuing some little leaflet, the apparatus of calumny. He did not think the duty of a politician was exhausted when he had refrained from calumniating his political opponents. He was equally bound to refrain from making it easy for other people to caluminate them. He listened with great interest and admiration to the speech of his right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer, whose lucidity of mind admirably qualified him for the position he held, but who must sometimes find things troublesome when he was acting, not as Chancellor of the Exchequer, but as a tariff reformer. He would have thought that, with his clear insight into these matters, and his power of expressing himself so distinctly, his right hon. friend must cause not only uneasiness to himself but to many of those with whom he came in contact, some of whom must be near and dear to him. His right hon. friend's defence of his system of taxation came to this, that it was not a protectionist tax, and that those protectionists who believed, like the hon. Member for Partick, that this was a protectionist tax were profoundly mistaken. They did not understand the subject—a thing he could easily assent to—and when properly understood it would be seen that it had no operation inconsistent with the principles of free trade. He would only observe, rather in the nature of question than of criticism, that he did not think the Chancellor of the Exchequer fully explained, in connection with stripping tobacco, the operation of the drawback, and whether the drawback did not already make such a distinction now as to place stripped on equal terms.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said he had already explained this matter in reply to a Question put by the hon. Member for Islington, and he did not think it was necessary when speaking that afternoon to again go into the details. The right hon. Gentleman stated the method by which the amount of the drawback was computed.

LORD HUGH CECIL said the case for the tax was this, that by stripping tobacco its value was increased, and that therefore there should be a scale of charge on the more valuable article. It was perfectly just to say that what the existing fiscal system did was to interfere with the natural course of trade, and that the alteration was in the direction of free trade in removing a protectionist advantage which the existing fiscal system gave to the foreigner. It was a delightful thing to hear his right hon. friend talking about the natural course of trade; and he was glad that he recognised that trade when it followed its natural course was doing the best it could possibly do for those seeking employment. His right hon. friend did not fall into the error of the hon. Member for Partick, who had supported this tax under a misapprehension, believing that here there was just a ray of sunlight coming over the eastern horizon, heralding the great luminary who was soon to cover the whole world with prosperity. His hon. friend thought that in the tobacco trade, as in any other trade, it was desirable to have a system which enhanced the demand for employment. That was one of the great mistakes of protectionists. There was an abundant demand for employment, and if there were not enough employment it would be perfectly easy to create opportunities of employment by setting up a gratuitous treadmill. What we so often overlooked was that it was not employment that was wanted, but remuneration for it. If by restricting importation the general wealth of the country was diminished, and if by forcing trade out of its natural course labour was employed in such a way as to produce a smaller return than was natural for that labour, there was a smaller fund to remunerate employment for the future; there was a less effective and remunerative demand for employment, and harm was actually done to the cause of employment. He dared say his hon. friends were aware that after the great storm of 1703—the storm of 1903 was of another character—the demand for labour was greatly increased. But if there had been a storm once a week for any length of time the country would have been rapidly reduced, of course, to the condition of a desert. Although the demand for labour might be very great there would be very little opportunity, after a little while, of remunerative employment, and the consequence would be that the people would be worse off, because of those hurricanes, than before. If you restricted wealth, if you shut out wealth, if you did not let it come into the country, you made labour less remunerative than it otherwise would be, and you were, as it were, an amateur hurricane. The right hon. Member for West Birmingham aspired, like the great Duke of Marlborough, to "ride the whirlwind and direct the storm;" and in so doing he called it scientific taxation. He made these observations quite humbly, not leaving his hon. friend the Member for Partick unconsoled at what might, after all, be the contemptuous putting aside of his views by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The hon. Member for Partick, as a protectionist, supported this tax. He was wrong, not for the first time, about fiscal matters. The hon. Member misapprehended the character of the tax. This was a pure free-trade tax and a pure free-trade Budget; and as such free-traders were entitled to support it.

MR. LOUGH said he was sure that hon. Members had all listened with delight to the speech of the hon. Member for Greenwich. No doubt the noble Lord spoke in the name of the Unionist free-traders, but their policy seemed to be that, although they denounced these duties, they were going to declare the Budget a free-trade Budget and vote for it. He regretted that decision on their part, but it would not alter the determination of the protagonists on free-trade from voting against the Budget. He must congratulate the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer on the excellent temper of his speech, with the exception of one or two sentences; and if the right hon. Gentleman had maintained the same colour in those sentences as in the rest of his speech, his reply to the speech of the hon. Member for Monmouthshire would have been more satisfactory. All the same, the House had not yet got a real reply to the hon. Member for Monmouthshire. The suggestion of the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich was that the conduct of the hon. Member for Monmouthshire was open to the censure of this House. He himself had not noticed any heat in the remarks of the hon. Member for Monmouthshire. The hon. Member had only called attention to the fact that a great quantity of stripped tobacco had been introduced into this country in March; and the House had not yet had any explanation of that. Why, then, should the Chancellor of the Exchequer get up heat when that fact was referred to? He remembered that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Bristol had to deal with a similar situation. Could the present Chancellor of the Exchequer throw any light on the fact of the greatly increased importation of stripped tobacco into this country immediately before the Budget? The Chancellor of the Exchequer's defence was that he had a precedent for all he did in the former conduct of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Bristol; that he had only carried out the right hon. Gentleman's policy with a slight extension of the principle then established. It was that sort of slight extension of principle of which they were so suspicious in this House. When they looked back on the Budget of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Bristol, they, on that side of the House, were not satisfied; but it now appeared that that right hon. Gentleman was not himself satisfied. Two years after the right hon. Gentleman brought in the corn tax that tax had to be abolished, because it was said that new circumstances had arisen, and that the experiment made two years previously could not be continued. Therefore, the House must be very strict in considering any proposal brought forward by the present Chancellor of the Exchequer. One great drawback to the system of indirect taxation was the favourable opening it gave to cheat not only the Chancellor of the Exchequer but the consumers of goods.

The House was entitled to complain of the numerous changes that had been made of recent years in the tobacco duties. Within the last six years the whole scale of the tobacco duties had been changed three times, whereas, in the thirty-five years from 1863 to 1898, there were only three changes. These frequent changes had convulsed the whole trade, and had cost in the printing of new price-lists more than the Chancellor of the Exchequer got from the increased duties. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had received a deputation the other day from the tobacco manufacturers, and one of the members of that deputation told him that he had 40,000 casks of tobacco which would be depreciated in value by the Chancellor's proposal by £10 per cask. If that were true, there would be a loss of £400,000 at once to the manufacturer to obtain a tax of £500,000. That man would not bear all that loss himself; he would pass it on to the consumer. The Chancellor of the Exchequer in reply said that he recognised that any alteration of this kind in the duties on tobacco was always *pro tanto*, at the moment, an evil to those in the trade, and that the necessity of any change in the taxes was an inconvenience and an irritation. His contention was that a change in any duty every two years was too gigantic in these times. Perhaps it would be possible in the course of these debates to convince the Chancellor of the Exchequer that it would be wise for him to abandon these duties. The fighting line he wished to take was that all these duties were strictly protective in their character. What did he mean by that? That any Customs duty on an imported article must be balanced by an Excise duty? Any variation from that sound principle was protection. He refused to receive any explanation that the proposed duties were a tax on luxuries. The late Colonial Secretary talked of imposing a protective tax on manufactured articles of 10 per cent.; and the Chancellor of the Exchequer was introducing a 10 per cent. tax on a process of manufacture of tobacco. The proposed tax on cigars and cigarettes was admitted by the Chancellor of the Exchequer himself to be a protective tax. The right hon. Gentleman said that the tax on cigars would produce £45,000 to the revenue, and he quoted as a precedent the late Chancellor of the Exchequer increasing the duty on cigars in war time by 8d. per lb. Now the present Chancellor of the Exchequer proposed an extension of the duty by 6d. per lb. That was an extremely suspicious procedure and was a very bad example of the protective principle. If it were imposed on foreign cigars, it would include colonial cigars as well.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: On all imported cigars.

Mr. LOUGH: Very well, that was another blow at the Colonies, and the Empire. India was sending a largely increased amount of cigars to this country, and a 6d. duty on Indian cigars would increase the difficulties of the situation. Had the Chancellor of the Exchequer estimated what it would cost the consumer in this country to obtain his £45,000—an extremely moderate sum—from the increased duty on cigars? We did not get one-fifth of our cigars from abroad; perhaps not a tenth; and the home manufacturers would put up the price of all cigars to the extent of the duty. What kept down the price of cigars was the foreign competition; and, if the home manufacturers raised the price to the extent of the duty, the consumers would pay £250,000 in order that the Chancellor of the Exchequer might obtain for the Exchequer £45,000. The Chancellor of the Exchequer said he hoped to improve the colonial trade; and the right hon. Gentleman had been very indignant all through the debate at the mention of the Tariff Reform Commission. It must be said that it was very curious how the principle of the Tariff Reform Commission had appeared at every stage of the speeches of the Chancellor of the Exchequer in these debates. The Chancellor of the Exchequer in his interview with Mr. Gallaher was full of the idea of giving a return to the Colonies: that his proposal would help the colonial trade in cigars; but he could not see that. Even if that happened, we would be helping the Colonies at great cost to the consumers in this country, and the Colonies would get cheap cigars on which they had not paid the duty, while the consumers in this country would be subjected to a burden of £250,000. The right hon. Gentleman had no precedent in the Budget of four years ago for dealing with the duty on cigarettes. The right hon. Gentleman's proposed huge duty of 1s. per. lb. on foreign cigarettes would only give him £20,000. The duty, it was said, was aimed at foreign cigarettes chiefly from Egypt and Turkey; but if the duty was to yield so small a sum as £20,000 it did not seem worth the trouble to impose it. One of the best houses for Egyptian cigarettes in the country was in Regent Street, and that firm would not take that impost "lying down," but would at once manufacture their cigarettes here, and the consumer would have to bear all the burden of the tax. That was an attempt to diminish foreign trade. He was not in favour of such attempts, because the less this country got from Egypt the less it would be able to send to Egypt.

With reference to the 3d. tax on stripped tobacco, one reason given for it was that its imposition would keep employment in this country. But that was contrary to the principles of free trade. They must not create employment at such great cost to the people of the country. The right hon. Gentleman said that this was the one process of manufacture which was not marked by any tax; and he proposed to differentiate his duties in order that it might be so marked. He thought the House had not yet got hold of what this tax really meant. They had heard that there was a difference of 1½d. between the price of stripped and unstripped tobacco; but the imposition of the duty would make a difference of 4½d. It was monstrous that the Chancellor of the Exchequer should have made such a violent interference with a staple of trade. The proposal was open to every objection that could be made against a protective tax. The right hon. Gentleman said his object was to create employment. He had seen an expert statement to the effect that the cost of stripping in the United States had increased from 40 cents to 60 cents per 100lbs.; and it was added that it was very unskilled labour confined to negroes. The object of the right hon. Gentleman was to bring this low-class trade into this country, and to deprive manufacturers of the liberty of importing either stripped or unstripped tobacco as they pleased. No worse reason for such a change could be given. It was an uneconomic change. Why should manufacturers be obliged to carry the stalks across the sea when they did not want them. The Chancellor of the Exchequer was full of the idea that if he could stimulate home trade even at the cost of foreign trade he would be doing a benefit to the country. It did not follow at all. If trade were allowed to flow along the ordinary channels that would be the highest benefit that could be conferred on the country. English merchants allowed the low-grade work of stripping to be done abroad, employing British labour on more remunerative work. Therefore the principle on which the Chancellor of the Exchequer was acting seemed to be a highly unsatisfactory one.

The right hon. Gentleman affected not to understand what hon. Members meant by a luxury tax. What they meant was that an article imported from abroad and mainly used by the rich should be subject to a duty, not a Customs duty only, because a Customs duty must always be balanced by an Excise duty if it was to be a free-trade tax. Any breach of that law seemed to him to be a breach of the principles on which Budgets had been based for many years. The Budget in all these respects seemed to him to be an audacious infringement of the settled policy which this country had practised for many years. All these taxes were protective in their nature and were also open to other serious objections. The Chancellor of the Exchequer stated that he got £12,500,000 sterling from the tobacco duties. That was a noble revenue to get from an article like tobacco; and it had been increasing for the last two or three years. No proposal was more dangerous when a tax was producing a splendid revenue, than to increase its weight. Very often that destroyed the productiveness of the tax, and when the Chancellor of the Exchequer was getting such a fine revenue out of tobacco it would have been far wiser for him to have been content with it and very possibly he would have got more out of the existing rates than he would get out of the higher rates he proposed to impose. There was ample experience during the last few years to show that that was true. The increase of 3d. per gallon on wines had brought in a smaller revenue, and the increase in the duties on beer and spirits were producing at the present moment most unsatisfactory results. Therefore the

Chancellor of the Exchequer would be wise to hesitate before increasing the tobacco duties.

The right hon. Gentleman stated that he was going to make considerable changes in the system of drawbacks. The right hon. Gentleman had not yet explained what those changes would be; but he stated that instead of one drawback he was going to substitute four or five. That would be a very complicated system and he thought that the simpler system would be better. The right hon. Gentleman was bound to lay his full plans before the House and country before he asked the House to pass this Resolution. The discussion had shown that the tax was open to very serious objections, and the amount of revenue would be very small, probably not more than half a million. A previous Chancellor of the Exchequer calculated he would get £600,000 out of the cheque tax; after discussion he was able to see he would not get that revenue, but that, on the contrary, the splendid revenue he was getting from cheques would be diminished. Many proposals introduced by Chancellors of the Exchequer had been abandoned recently. The taxes on offal, sale notes, and invoices had been abandoned, and he would suggest to the Chancellor of the Exchequer that he should keep an open mind on this matter, on the ground that it was by no means certain whether these complicated new duties would produce any more revenue than at present, and that he should not treat the arguments of the Opposition with too much contempt, but should consider whether another course might not be adopted.

MAJOR JAMESON (Clare, W.) said he desired to warmly resent the insinuations and attacks that had been directed against Mr. Gallaher, who was a personal friend of his, the largest tobacco manufacturer in Ireland, a worthy Belfast citizen, one of the leading Liberals in that city, and a member of the National Liberal Club in London. Mr. Gallaher was one of the few men in Ireland who was able to give large employment to labour, and he protested against his being held up to ignominy for what he was certain Mr. Gallaher had never done, and brought before the House as a gentleman unworthy of trust simply for the purpose of attacking the Government through him. The tax would come out of Mr. Gallaher's own pocket—it certainly would not come out of the poorer classes of tobacco—and it was somewhat surprising that the only tax which hon. Members had attacked in this way was just the one which would bring employment, not to Chinese, but to some 400 or 500 worthy Irishmen. This tax would take money out of the pockets of the large manufacturers, but would not raise the price of the lower classes of tobacco. The tax would give more employment to the workpeople, and he would be delighted to see any tax placed on any commodity if it would keep Irish workmen in their own country.

*MR. AINSWORTH (Argyllshire) said that every hon. Member would concur that whatever might be the fiscal policy adopted on that side of the House, it was advocated solely with the view to benefiting the working people in Great Britain, and, of course, in Ireland also. It seemed to him rather extraordinary that the debate should have collapsed without some attempted explanation of the extraordinary facts brought before the House by his hon. friend the Member for North Monmouthshire. He should like to know, if hon. Members opposite were in opposition, and became aware of the facts referred to by his hon. friend, whether there was not one of them who would not consider that he would be false in his duty to this House and to his constituents if he did not immediately bring the facts to the attention of the House. One thing they did expect from heads of Departments in this House, and that was a feeling of responsibility. A head of a Department was bound not only to justify himself, but also to justify every official who served under him. Therefore many hon. Members felt surprised that his hon. friend the Member for North Monmouthshire should have been criticised for bringing what he would describe as an "extraordinary accident" before the House. Let them look at the position of the man in the street. He naturally discussed with his neighbour what the next thing to be taxed would be, and he went into the market and bought the article which he expected would be taxed. But what he wanted to know was this, why should any individual in this country go into the market and buy, not tobacco generally, but one particular kind of tobacco. He thought it was the duty of the Government to give an explanation, if there was any explanation to give; or, if they had no explanation, to say so. This was an object lesson to the House and the country of what would happen if they began to flirt with protection. Enormous private interests were at once brought on the scene. There was an old saying that "nobody got lost on a straight road." They on that side of the House thought that as long as they adhered to free-trade principles they were on a straight road. There was also a sequel to that saying, which was that "nobody travelled so far as the man who did not know where he was going." That, he thought, represented the position of the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Government. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would give his most earnest attention to the facts placed before him and that he would be able to give a satisfactory explanation regarding them.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 250; Noes, 176. (Division List No. 105.)

AYES.

Allhusen, Augustus Hen. Eden
Allsopp, Hon. George
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Mich. Hicks
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boulnois, Edmund
Bowles, Lt.-Col. H. F (Middlesex
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Rt. Hn. Sir John C. R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies, Sir H. D. (Chatham)
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dimsdale, Rt. Hn. Sir Joseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dxon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Forster, Henry William
Foster, P. S. (Warwick, S.W.)
Fyler, John Arthur
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elign&Nairn)
Gore, Hn G. R. C. Ormsby-(Salop
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Green, Walford D. (Wednesbury
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hamilton, Marq of (L'nd'nderry
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th
Harris, Dr. Fredk. R. (Dulwich
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, A. Howard (Hanley)
Heath, James (Staffords., N.W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F (Sheffield, Brightside)
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hutton, John (Yorks., N. R.)
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kerr, John
Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Sir Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Jos. (Monm'th)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, J. Grant (Yorks., N.R.
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hon. W. (Bristol, S.)
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Calmont, Colonel James

M'Iver, Sir Lewis(EdinburghW
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell,RtHnSir H.E(Wigt'n)
Maxwell, W.J.H. (Dumfriessh.
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. W.
Middlemore, Jn. Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt.Hn.Sir Frederick G.
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Peel, Hn.Wm.Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederick Carne
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Ridley, Hon. M.W.(Stalybridge
Ridley, S.Forde(BethnalGreen)
Ritchie, Rt.Hn. Chas.Thomson
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robinson, Brooke
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Sir H. S. (Limehouse)
Sandys, Lt.-Col. Thos. Myles
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart,Sir H. (Renfrew)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford, East)
Smith,H C(North'mb.Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Edward Jas.(Somerset
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt.Hn.J.G(Oxf'dUniv.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Rt.Hn.Sir WilliamH.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col.A.C.E(Taunton
Welby, Sir Chas. G. E. (Notts.)
Whiteley, H.(Ashton und.Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wilson, J.W.(Worcestersh.,N.)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W.H.(Yorks.
Wodehouse, Rt.Hn. E.R.(Bath
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Asher, Alexander
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herb. Henry
Austin, Sir John
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Crean, Eugene
Crombie, John William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan)
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice,Capt E.C(S.Andrw'sBghs
Emmott, Alfred
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Evans, Sir F. H. (Maidstone)
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Ffrench, Peter
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Gilhooly, James
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herb. John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt.Hn. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Lewis V.(Rossendale
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones,William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kilbride, Denis
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Leamy, Edmund
Leese, Sir Jos. F. (Accrington)
Leng, Sr John
Levy, Maurice
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah

M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Mooney, John J.
Morley, Rt.Hn John (Montrose
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newnes, Sir George
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Jas. (Roscommon, N.)
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Partington, Oswald
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, Wiliam (Clare)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Roche, John
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Seely, Maj.J.E.B.(Isleof Wight
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt.Hn.C.R(Northants
Sullivan, Donal
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A.(Glamorgan,E.)
Thomas, D. Alfred (Merthyr)
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Wallace, Robert
Wason, Jn. Cathcart (Orkney)
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse,Sir J.T(Huddersf'd
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Robson and Mr. Lough.

WAYS AND MEANS (26TH APRIL).

Resolutions reported.

Continuance of Additional Customs Duties on Tobacco, Beer, and Spirits.

1. "That the additional Customs duties on tobacco, beer, and spirits imposed by sections two, three, four, and five of The Finance Act, 1900 (including any increased duties imposed by section five of that Act), shall continue to be charged until the 1st day of August, 1905."

Continuance of Additional Excise Duties on Beer and Spirits.

2. "That the additional Excise duties on beer and spirits imposed by sections six and seven of The Finance Act, 1900, shall continue to be charged until the 1st day of August, 1905."

Amendment of Law.

3. "That it is expedient to amend the Law relating to the National Debt, Customs, and Inland Revenue."

Resolutions read a second time.

First Resolution.

Mr. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs) moved the omission of the word "tobacco" from the first line of the Resolution. He said that his object was to enter a protest against the continuance of war taxation in time of peace. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, instead of giving any satisfactory explanation, had assumed that peace expenditure might in some cases be more than even war expenditure, whereas during the war the taxpayers were consoled by the promise that when the war was over the extra taxes would be removed.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 1, to leave out the word 'tobacco.'"—(*Mr. Dalziel.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'tobacco' stand part of the said Resolution."

Mr. FLYNN (Cork County, N.) pointed out that in a little over half a century the taxation of the country had increased from £53,000,000 to £142,000,000, and as this burden pressed with especial hardship upon Ireland, he heartily supported the Amendment. Ireland paid at present more than 76 per cent. of indirect taxation, and she protested against a burden which could be necessitated only by the urgency of war or by a policy of extravagant expenditure.

Mr. WHITLEY (Halifax) desired to add his protest against the continuance of war taxation in time of peace. He thought it was the duty of the House to vote against all these duties until a return to economy was promised. As he did not anticipate any such return during the existence of the present Government, he conceived it to be the duty of all who hoped for a return to a reasonable rate of expenditure to take every opportunity of voting against the proposals of the Government until they took the judgment of the country upon the manner in which they had used the power obtained under false pretences three or four years ago.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 254; Noes, 178. (Division List No. 106.)

AYES.

Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Allsopp, Hon. George
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arnold-Forster, Rt.Hn.HughO
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt.Hn. Sir.H
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt.Hn. A.J.(Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barry, Sir Francis T.(Windsor)
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beach, RtHn.Sir Mich. Hicks
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boulnois, Edmund
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Lt.-Col.H.F(Middlesex
Bowles, T.Gibson(King's Lynn
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Butcher, John George
Campbell,Rt.Hn.J.A.(Glasgow)
Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt.Hon.J.(Birm.
Chamberlain,Rt.Hn.J.A(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Colomb, Rt.Hn.Sir John C. R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. Athole H.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, William Bromley-
Davies, Sir H. D. (Chatham)
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dimsdale, Rt.Hn.Sir Joseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt.Hn.Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fergusson,Rt.Hn.Sir J(Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Forster, Henry William
Foster, P. S. (Warwick, S.W.)
Fyler, John Arthur
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Gordon, Hn.J.E.(Elgin&Nairn)
Gore, Hon. S.F.Ormsby-(Linc.)
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Green, Walford D.(Wednesbury
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton,RtHn LordG(Midd'x
Hamilton,Marq.of(L'nd'nderry
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th
Harris, Dr. Fredk. R. (Dulwich
Harwood, George
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, A. Howard (Hanley)
Heath, James (Staffords., N.W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A.(Stafford, W.)
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F(Sheffield,Brightside
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, J. (Midd.,Tottenham)
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hutton, John (Yorks., N. R.)
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
Knowles, Sir Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Jos. (Monmouth)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, J. Grant (Yorks., N.R.
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Leege, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hon. W. (Bristol, S.)
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J.(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Calmont, Colonel James
M'Iver, Sir Lewis(Edinburgh W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell,Rt Hn.SirH.E(Wigton
Maxwell, W.J.H. (Dumfriessh.
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Middlemore,John Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt.Hn.Sir Frederick G.
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.

Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Nicholson, William Graham
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Ridley, Hon. M.W.(Stalybridge
Ridley, S.Forde(Bethnal Green
Ritchie, Rt.Hn.Chas. Thomson
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robinson, Brooke
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Sir H. S. (Limehouse)
Sandys, Lt.-Col. Thos. Myles
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Seely, Maj.J.E.B.(Isle of Wight
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Smith, H C(North'mb.Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Edward Jas.(Somerset
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'd Univ
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C.E.H(Sheff'ld)
Walrond, Rt.Hn.Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col.A.C.E(Taunton
Welby, Sir Chas. G. E. (Notts.)
Whiteley, H.(Ashton und.Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wilson, J.W.(Worcestersh., N.)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W.H.(Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt.Hn. E.R.(Bath
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Asher, Alexander
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herb. Henry
Austin, Sir John
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M.(Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Crean, Eugene
Crombie, John William
Cullinan, J.
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Mamsay (Galway
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice, Capt EC(S.Andrw'sBghs
Emmott, Alfred
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Ffrench, Peter
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Gilhooly, James
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hn. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hn. Richard B.
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Lewis V.(Rossendale
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hn. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hn. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen Arthur C.
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, David Brynmor(Swansea
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kilbride, Denis
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal W.
Lawson, Sir Wilfred (Cornwall
Leamy, Edmund
Leese, Sir Joseph F.(Accrington
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mooney, John J.
Morley, Charles (Breconshire
Morley, Rt.Hn.John(Montrose
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newnes, Sir George
Nolan, Col.John P.(Galway, N.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry

Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien, James F. X.
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon N.
O'Malley William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Partington, Oswald
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roche, John
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R. (Northants
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Wallace, Robert
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W. R.
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, Sir J. T (Huddersf'd
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Dalziel and Mr. Whitley.

Motion made and Question put, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution."

The House divided :—Ayes, 259; Noes, 173. (Division List No. 107.)

AYES.

Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Allsopp, Hon. George
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt. Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Michael Hicks
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boulnois, Edmund
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Lt.-Col. H. F (Middlesex
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brymer, William Ernest
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Carson, Rt. Hon Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn J. A. (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Rt. Hon. Sir John C. R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Dewar, Sir T. R. (Tower Hamlets
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dickson Poynder, Sir John P.
Dimsdale, Rt. Hon. Sir Joseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S.W.
Fyler, John Arthur
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Green, Walford D. (Wednesbury
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Rt. Hon Lord G (Mid'x
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nderry
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th)
Harris, Dr. Fredk. R. (Dulwich)
Harwood, George
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley)
Heath, James (Staffords. N.W.)
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.)
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hutton, John (Yorks, N.R.)
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kerr, John
Keswick, William

Kimber, Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Sir Lees
Lambton, Hon.Frederick Wm.
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence,SirJoseph(Monm'th)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson,JohnGrant(Yorks.N.R
Lee,ArthurH.(Hants.,Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long,Col.Charles W. (Evesham
Long,Rt.Hn. Walter(Bristol,S)
Lowther, C. (Cumb. Eskdale)
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas,ReginaldJ.(Portsmouth)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Calmont, Colonel James
M'Iver,SirLewis(Edinburgh W.
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell,Rt.Hn.SirH.E(Wigt'n
Maxwell, W.J.H.(Dumfriessh.)
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Middlemore,JohnThrogmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt.Hn. Sir FrederickG.
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G. (Bute)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Nicholson, William Graham
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Peel,Hn.Wm.Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ridley,S.Forde (Bethnal Green
Ritchie, Rt.Hn.Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel,SirHarry S.(Limehouse
Sandys, Lt.-Col. Thos. Myles
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Seely,Maj.J.E.B.(Isle of Wight
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Shackleton, David James
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford,East)
Smith,H.C(North'mb.Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks)
Smith, Hon. W.F.D. (Strand)
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich
Stanley, Edward Jas.(Somerset
Stanley, Rt. Hn. Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt.Hn.J.G(Oxf'dUniv.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thomas,DavidAlfred(Merthyr)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lt.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent,Col.SirC.E.H(Sheffield
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond,Rt.Hn.Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby,Lt.-Col.A.C.E.(Taunt'n
Welby,Sir Charles G.E.(Notts.)
Whiteley,H.(Ashton und.Lyne
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley(York,E.R.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wilson,J.W.(WorcestershireN.
Wilson-Todd,Sir W.H.(Yorks.)
Wodehouse,Rt.Hn.E.R.(Bath)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C.B.Stuart-
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork,N.E.)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Asher, Alexander
Asquith,Rt.Hn.Herbert Henry
Austin, Sir John
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Crean, Eugene
Crombie, John William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan
Delany, William
Devlin,CharlesRamsay(Galway
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice,Capt.EC(S.Andrw'sBghs
Emmott, Alfred
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Evans,SirFrancisH.(Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Ffrench, Peter
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gilhooly, James
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey,Rt. Hon. Sir E.(Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Lewis V.(Rossendale
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.

Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutchinson, Dr. CharlesFredk.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, DavidBrynmor(Swansea
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kilbride, Denis
Kitson, Sir James
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Law, Hugh Alex.(Donegal, W.)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Leamy, Edmund
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mooney, John J.
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John(Montrose
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newnes, Sir George
Nolan, Col. John P.(Galway, N.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien, Kendal(Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, James(Roscommon N.
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Partington, Oswald
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E.(Waterford)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roche, John
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R. (Northants
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Wallace, Robert
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whiteley, J. H. (Halifax)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J.(York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, SirJT.(Huddersf'd
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Flynn and Mr. Flavin.

Second Resolution.

Mr. BROADHURST (Leicester) moved to leave out the words "beer and" in the first line. His object was not so much to remove the tax on beer as to point out another way in which the revenue could be obtained. He thought the Chancellor of the Exchequer could easily have found a more direct way of raising this branch of the revenue than by continuing the tax in this form. He would humbly suggest to the right hon. Gentleman that he should raise this special revenue by means of a higher tax on the beer sold in tied houses. At the present moment the supply of intoxicating drinks to the public was a monopoly granted to certain people by the law of the land. A large number of these people added to that monopoly, by a scheme of their own, another monopoly. Under the conditions of the tied-house system the licencees were only allowed to supply one particular class of beer brewed by a particular brewer. Here was a double monopoly protected by the law which, he thought, ought not to exist.

*Mr. SPEAKER said the hon. Member was proposing a new tax. That could not be done on the Report stage of the Resolution.

Mr. BROADHURST said his only object was that they should have a different tax on beer supplied to tied houses, which formed a double monopoly, from that which was supplied to free houses.

*Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Gentleman is entirely out of order.

Mr. BROADHURST said he could see the point the Speaker had made, but he thought he had mentioned the direction in which the Chancellor of the Exchequer should go to make good the deficiency which would be caused by striking out these words. At any rate the House would see what he would do if he were the Chancellor of the Exchequer. He begged to move that in line 1 of the second Resolution the words "beer and" be left out.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 1, to leave out the words 'beer and.'"—(*Mr. Broadhurst.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'beer and' stand part of the said Resolution."

Mr. LABOUCHERE (Northampton) said that under ordinary circumstances he would not oppose a tax on beer; but he considered that the present circumstances were extraordinary, and he fell back on the old constitutional doctrine that when they thoroughly distrusted the Government, when they held that the country had protested against the Government's retention of office in every way it possibly could, when the Government came forward with a fiscal policy—and they did not know whether some great intrigue was going on at the present moment to evade bringing that great fiscal policy before the country, in order to win over the country to it—then he thought every constitutional means should be used to resist every tax the Government proposed.

Mr. WHITLEY said he was extremely glad his hon. friend had raised this question. He quite understood it was necessary to keep within the limits of the Speaker's ruling, and that it was not possible, on the Report of the Resolution, to discuss at any length a substitute for the proposals contained in the Resolutions; but he thought they were justified in saying that the Chancellor of the Exchequer might very well, instead of taking this curious readjustment of the tobacco duty, set his mind with more advantage to make a readjustment of the beer duties. At present the beer duties were all in favour of the big man, and against the small man. Year by year the small man and the free publican were being shut out, and the whole method of Excise and beer duty favoured the large brewing companies, who were continually increasing their grip upon the country. This was one of those instances where the Chancellor of the Exchequer might utilise an Excise duty in the interests of the community as a whole by removing this encouragement to monopoly. Within the last twenty years the free publican had been almost crushed out of the trade, and at present hardly 5 per cent. of free publicans remained. He was very grateful to the hon. Member for Leicester for having raised this question, and he hoped the House would give an emphatic support to the idea he had put forward.

Mr. CORRIE GRANT (Warwickshire, Rugby) said he wished to support the Amendment from an entirely different point of view to that taken by the hon. Member for Northampton. He never drank any beer himself, but his desire was to see a legitimate amount of taxation got from those who drank beer and those who brewed and sold it. He ventured to suggest that it would be possible for the Chancellor of the Exchequer to obtain more revenue by other methods than those which the right hon. Gentleman had put in force. It had been suggested that there should be a graduation of the tax so as to make it heavier than at present on those who purveyed the beer. That would be no hardship on them at all. The question of the differentiation of the tax between tied and free houses was not before the House for the first time; and he maintained that it was right to make such a distinction. The Chancellor of the Exchequer ought to be encouraged to carry out that suggestion.

Mr. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield) said he quite agreed with his hon. friend the Member for Northampton that they ought to oppose all taxation proposed by the Government. At the same time he thought the suggestion thrown out by the hon. Member for Leicester had a great deal to commend it. He did not say that the hon. Member's actual plan was the right one. Another plan had been suggested by the hon. Member for Dundee. The tax on beer was not put on in the way it ought to be. Some protection ought to be given to the free publican, and the tax should be divided between the seller and the consumer to a greater extent than at the present moment.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 236; Noes, 163. (Division List No. 108.)

AYES.

Allhusen, Augustus H. Eden
Allsopp, Hon. George
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hn. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert

Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hn. Allen Benjamin
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boulnois, Edmund
Bousfield, William Robert
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brymer, William Ernest
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt Hn.JA(Glasgow)
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V.C.W. Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt.Hn.JAWorc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hn. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Rt. Hn. Sir John C.R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim,S
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies, Sir H. D. (Chatham)
Denny, Colonel
Dewar, Sir T.R.Tower Hamlets
Dickson, Charles Scott
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir Wm. Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. R. Douglas
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzroy, Hon. Ed. Algernon
Foster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S.W.
Fyler, John Arthur
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Gordon, Hn.J.E.(Elgin &Nairn
Gore, Hon. S.F.Ormsby-(Linc.)
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Green, W. D. (Wednesbury)
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Gretton, John
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hamilton, Mar. of L'nd'nderry
Harris, F. Leverton(Tynem'th)
Harris, Dr. Fred. R. (Dulwich)
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Heath, Arthur H. (Hanley)
Heath, James (Staffords, N.W.)
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Hozier, Hon. James Henry C.
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hutton, John (Yorks, N.R.)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur F.
Kenyon, Hon. G. T. (Denbigh
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
Knowles, Sir Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick W.
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir J. (Monm'th)
Lawson, J. Grant (Yorks,N.R.)
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, FrederickN.S.
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A.R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hon. W. (Bristol, S.)
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, ReginaldJ. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool
M'Calmont, Colonel James
M'Iver, Sir L. (Edinburgh, W.)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian.
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell,RtHnSir H.E.(Wigt'n
Maxwell, W.J.H. (Dumfriessh
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Middlemore, J. Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, R.Hn.Sir Frederick G.
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray, C.
Muntz, Sir Philip W.
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Nicholson, William Graham.
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones Lt.- Col. Edward
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Ridley, Hon. M.W.(Stalybridge
Ridley, S.Forde(Bethnal Green
Ritchie, Rt.Hn.Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Sir H. S. (Limehouse)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Seely, Maj.J.E.B.(Isleof Wight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford, East)
Smith,H.C(North'mb.Tyneside
Smith,James Parker (Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Edward Jas.(Somerset
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent,Col.Sir C.E.H.(Sheff'ld
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond, Rt.Hn.Sir WilliamH.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col.A.C.E(Taunton
Welby, Sir Chas. G. E. (Notts.)
Whiteley, H.(Ashton und.Lyne
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wilson-Todd, Sir W. H. (Yorks

Wodehouse, Rt.Hn. E.R.(Bath
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland - Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Asher, Alexander
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herb. Henry
Austin, Sir John
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Burke, E. Haviland
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Emmott, Alfred
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Evans, Sir F. H. (Maidstone)
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Ffrench, Peter
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gilhooly, James
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herb. John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hammond, John
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kilbride, Denis
Kitson, Sir James
Lambert, George
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Leamy, Edmund
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mooney, John J.
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newnes, Sir George
Nolan, Col. J. P. (Galway, N.)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt, Cecil William
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, Jas. (Wicklow, W.)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Jas. (Roscommon, N.)
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Partington, Oswald
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roche, John
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt.Hn.C.R(Northants
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyn, Charles Philips
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Wallace, Robert
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T
Wason, Jn. Cathcart (Orkney)
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Woodhouse, Sir J.T(Huddersf'd
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Broadhurst and Mr. Labouchere.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution."

MR. FLYNN rose to move that the House do disagree with the Resolution.

And, it being after half-past Seven of the clock, the debate stood adjourned till this Evening's Sitting.

EVENING SITTING.

WAYS AND MEANS [26TH APRIL] REPORT.

Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on Question [3rd May], "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the Second Resolution, 'That the additional Excise duties on beer and spirits imposed by Sections 6 and 7 of the Finance Act, 1900, shall continue to be charged until the 1st day of August, 1905.'"

Question again proposed.

MR. FLYNN drew attention to the fact that this Resolution was drawn up in exact conformity with the terms of the corresponding Resolution of the Budget of 1900, and said that in the discussion on the Budget then marvellous justification for the attitude they had taken up was to be found in the speech of the then Chancellor of the Exchequer the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Bristol. The right hon. Gentleman then admitted that the tax on spirits was a very heavy one, but justified the addition of 6d., which he then put on, by the statement that it was a temporary war tax which would be taken off in the following year. No one could foresee that the war would have lasted so long and have cost so much blood and treasure, and therefore no blame was to be attached to the right hon. Gentleman for not reducing the tax on spirits in 1901; but what the House ought to know, and what they wanted to know, was why the present Chancellor of the Exchequer should now, when the war was concluded, still levy this tax. He should not oppose the tax upon beer if the right hon. Gentleman was hard up, but the tax on whiskey was quite a different matter. Over and over again both Irish and Scotch Members had protested against this unfair and continuous taxation of spirits to this high amount. Such a tax unquestionably led to intemperance, owing to the inevitable tendency there was to dilute the spirit in the first place, or to the placing of impure spirits on the market in order to ensure a profit to the retailer at the expense of the consumer. In the interests of temperance, only such a tax should be placed on this commodity as would ensure a spirit of a healthful and innocuous character, and not of a dangerous one, being placed upon the market. In Ireland they might fairly complain that this tax was specially unfair to them. Fifty years ago the tax was only 3s. 4d. a gallon; a few years later it rose to 4s. 8d.; then in 1858 it rose to 8s.; and in 1860 was increased to 10s. In 1894 it went up to 11s.; it was subsequently reduced to 10s. 6d. at which point it remained until 1900, when the right hon. Gentleman, as a purely temporary expedient to raise money for the war, increased it again by 6d.; and at the present moment it stood at 11s. The tax upon beer represented only one-sixth of the value of the article taxed, that upon whiskey three or four times the value. He contended it was most unfair to continue this duty, and opposed the Resolution, first, because the extra 6d. was put on as a temporary war tax, and it was not right to keep it on in time of peace; secondly, because it was against the interests of temperance; thirdly, because it was a direct violation of the pledge given by the right hon. Member for West Bristol to remove it when the war came to a conclusion; and lastly, because it increased the burden of indirect taxation, already too high in Ireland.

SIR E. DURNING-LAWRENCE (Cornwall, Truro) said he felt very strongly that it was the duty of the Chancellor of the Exchequer to make the duty on spirits as high as possible. In the interests of temperance they should not be too cheap, and as the continuous raising of the duty from 3s. 4d. to its present limit had prevented intemperance, he congratulated all the Chancellors of the Exchequer who had contributed to the increase of the duty, not forgetting the late Mr. Gladstone. The last Radical Government in this country—the last he hoped for many years to come—in 1894 reduced the duty on whiskey by 6d. and that was the Party which called itself the "Temperance Party." When it became necessary to raise money for the war the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Bristol reimposed, as he thought wisely, the 6d. on the duty on spirits. Was this the time to take it off? He thought not. He did not think it was the time to reduce any taxation, least of all that on spirits. Various Chancellors of the Exchequer had considered this question, and Mr. Gladstone laid it down almost as a law that the Chancellor of the Exchequer should put as high a duty on spirits as could be collected. If spirits could be retailed at anywhere near the price they cost to produce, he did not know what would become of temperance in this country, and therefore a high duty was most beneficial. Spirits could be produced at about the rate of 5d. a bottle. Whether 11s. a gallon was the highest limit of taxation that could be put upon whiskey he did not know, but if it were he did not think that the temperance reformers would thank the Government for reducing it. Every Member of the House—with the exception of the representatives of Ireland on the National Benches, who were never tired of telling the House that they would provide nothing towards the expenditure of this country—was proud to think that there was a Government in power strong enough to carry this tax. In his opinion a time when a great European nation was threatening us with regard to our operations in Tibet was not the time to reduce our taxation, and he should certainly support the Resolution.

Mr. SAMUEL YOUNG (Cavan, E.) said of all articles of general consumption whiskey was the most heavily taxed. Whiskey could be produced at from 1s. to 1s. 3d. a gallon 25 degrees over proof, and the tax upon that was 13s. 9d., or 11s. per gallon of proof spirit. He associated himself with all that had been said against the Resolution, and if a division was taken he should vote against it.

Mr. GROVES (Salford, S.) said that although to his mind the additional tax on beer and spirits imposed in consequence of the war might with advantage have been remitted to a certain extent, still he was prepared to accept it for another year, in the hope that when the financial outlook became brighter the Chancellor of the Exchequer would carry out the half promise which he had made them and would consider favourably the claims made by the trade affected.

Sir FREDERICK BANBURY (Camberwell, Peckham), in supporting the Resolution, said the arguments adduced against it by the other side were of a most extraordinary character. The expenses of the country now were just as great as they were during the war, yet hon. Gentlemen opposite intended to vote against this Resolution which was to provide for the expenditure of the country. The record of the House for the last two months had been most extraordinary; the arguments of hon. Members who endeavoured to secure economy in the expenditure of the country which was, they thought, too great, had always been met by someone who got up with some special object on which he thought more money ought to be spent, and who, if listened to, would effectually prevent that economy which was so much desired by others. He did not see, if the argument that whiskey was too highly taxed were successful, how that would tend to the economy of expenditure, but assuming, for the sake of argument, that the tax on whiskey were to be reduced, it would be found that, instead of increasing sobriety, a very long step had been taken towards increasing inebriety, and this at a time when the Government were considering a measure of temperance reform. One hon. Gentleman opposite announced, as a reason for opposing this Resolution, his intention of voting against every tax proposed by the Government. He appealed to hon. Gentlemen opposite to say whether it was possible to carry on the government of this country if the Party opposite were prepared to vote against every tax proposed by the Government on the ground, not that it was a bad tax, but that the Government proposed it.

Mr. J. F. HOPE (Sheffield, Brightside) said he had no fear as to the result of the division, if a division were to be taken, because it was painfully apparent that the hon. Member opposite, the hon. Member for Cork, could not hope to receive the support of the Opposition as a whole. It was quite clear the hon. Member for Halifax could not support him. If he ventured to do so he would not dare to show his face in Halifax again. Nor could the hon. Member for Barnstaple, because if he did what would the Bible Christians of Barnstaple say? Would the constituents of the hon. Member for Barnstaple approve of his action if he supported the Amendment?

MR. SOARES (Devonshire, Barnstaple) said his constituents would approve of anything that would turn out the present Administration.

MR. J. F. HOPE said he thought that the Bible Christians of Barnstaple would put their religious belief above Party; and he was quite certain that they would not approve of anything which would increase the consumption of spirits. Again, there were well organised temperance societies in Crewe, and he would put it to the hon. Member for Crewe what would they say if he encouraged the drinking of cheap ardent spirits? What would the Rechabites of Keighley say if the hon. Member for that constituency voted for an Amendment, the only result of which would be to promote intemperance. The hon. Member for Kincardineshire promoted a Bill the ostensible object of which was the promotion of temperance. It was quite clear he could not possibly vote for the Amendment. He had mentioned five Members who could not oppose the Resolution; and there were many others. This was a serious question which ought to be properly debated. [AN HON. MEMBER: Your majority has arrived and it is all right now.] That was really an impertinent observation. [HON. MEMBERS: Order, order!] He remembered a few years ago that the Chairman of Committees ruled that if the word "impertinent" were used in an offensive sense it was out of order, but that if it were used in the sense of not being pertinent it was in order. It was in the latter sense that he had used it. It was a *reductio ad absurdum* that he should be denounced as a protectionist if he proposed a tax on a fully manufactured piano imported from abroad, and yet these duties should be placed not only on spirits and beer but also on tea. From that point of view he would be inclined to vote against these duties; but the Chancellor of the Exchequer wanted the money, and if taxation was to be revised it certainly would not be the spirit duty that would be the first to be reduced. Hon. Members opposite were all in favour of the taxation of luxuries. Was whiskey a necessity or a luxury? Would the hon. Member for Barnstaple say that whiskey was a necessity? Of course, he would not. If it was a luxury it could only be consumed by persons with plenty of means who could afford to pay for it. He agreed that the burden of taxation should fall on the rich.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.) asked if the hon. Gentleman would say whether a pigtail was a luxury or a necessity?

MR. J. F. HOPE said that if he could not grow his hair in any more becoming fashion, he should say it was a necessity. If the Chancellor of the Exchequer wished to encourage temperance he should pass a Resolution whereby all spirits should be kept in bond for two or three years.

SIR JOSEPH LEESE rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put," but MR. SPEAKER withheld his assent, and declined then to put that Question.

MR. J. F. HOPE said he wished to know if hon. Gentlemen opposite would vote for the abolition of Customs duties on foreign spirits. If they were prepared to do that, and also vote against this Resolution it was quite clear that they would be violating one of their fundamental principles, because in that case they would be voting against Customs duties on foreign spirits, and, at the same time, doing away with Excise on home spirits. If, for instance, the hon. Gentleman for Accrington said he was ready to vote against the taxation of foreign spirits he could not possibly vote against the Resolution. With regard to Ireland, the treatment which the English Government meted out to that country in the eighteenth century was something which no Englishman could contemplate with equanimity.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member will not be in order in entering on the question of taxation as between England and Ireland.

Mr. J. F. HOPE said that undoubtedly the tax on spirits did weigh very heavily on Ireland; and he should be very glad if something could be done to relieve Ireland in this matter. He wanted to know when he was drinking a glass of Irish whisky whether he was helping Ireland or not. One theory was that the tax fell on the producer, and another theory was that it fell on the consumer. He should like to know from some authority like the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Wolverhampton where the incidence of taxation really was in this matter. What he wanted to know was—Did the burden of the duty fall on the Irish taxpayer or the English consumer? He could suggest many better means of raising revenue, and he proposed to invite the attention of hon. Members opposite to other sources of taxation to show them how the general basis could be broadened. Personally he felt bound to vote for these duties and to give the Chancellor of the Exchequer his loyal support, although there were many points in the Budget which he was compelled to adversely criticise. If he had to produce a Budget representing his own fiscal views it would, no doubt, differ from that which was now before the House. He would read to the House some words of Burke with regard to the consumption of spirits from a moral point of view. The hon. Member, amid many interruptions, proceeded to read a long extract from a speech by Burke on the whisky duty.

***Mr. SPEAKER** (interrupting): I hope the hon. Member will endeavour to make his observations more relevant.

Mr. J. F. HOPE said he always had had a weakness for Burke, but he would not press the matter further. Because he believed the duties were just he should vote for their continuation and against the Amendment.

Mr. SOARES said the speeches to which they had just listened were a scathing commentary on the Motion for the suspension of the Twelve O'clock Rule that night. They were to sit there until a late hour in the morning in order that they might have the privilege of listening to speeches made by hon. Gentlemen opposite, who had suddenly developed an intense interest in the discussion. He had been challenged as to his vote. It was true that Liberals had voted against the tax on tobacco and the tax on beer, and if there was a division they would vote against the tax on spirits. Yet when they got into power, as they very soon would, they had not the remotest intention of diminishing these taxes by a single penny. What was the reason for it? In acting thus they were acting on the good old constitutional rule of refusing supplies to a Government which had not got the confidence of the country. They intended to follow this policy until the present Parliament came to an end.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Before I deal with the remarks of the hon. Member for Barnstaple I wish to say a few words as to what has fallen from my hon. friend the Member for South Salford, lest they should give rise to some misconception at a future time. My hon. friend alluded to a deputation which he introduced to me, and which put their case very fairly before me, and he suggested I made a certain half promise. Well, I made one definite statement which was more than half a promise, I said I thought I did them no injustice in saying that they came to me not so much with the idea of getting an immediate remission of the duties which press upon dealers in alcohol as with a desire to keep alive their claim to consideration whenever a chance of remission arose. What I did promise was that if I were responsible at that time I would consider their claim along with the claims of others. My hon. friend will see that this was a promise which I should make to every taxpayer.

Mr. GROVES: "Hope springs eternal," especially in the breast of the publican and the trade.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: And I do not wish to destroy that hope. Still it is a promise which every man in my position might make, and would be bound to fulfil with regard to every taxpayer who feels himself aggrieved by any tax. Certainly the trade is entitled to full consideration, and all that it can urge in favour of a remission of duty shall be considered. So, also, all that can be urged by other taxpayers in favour of the remission of the taxation which presses hardly on them will be considered. It is, however, useless to discuss the relative urgency of their claim when there is no possibility of relief. It has been stated by the hon. Member for North Cork that the continuation of these duties is a distinct violation of a promise made by my right hon. friend the Member for West Bristol when imposing them. It is true that the right hon. Gentleman when imposing them did express a hope that they would be only temporary, and no doubt that is the utterance to which the hon. Member for North Cork refers. But the right hon. Gentleman recurred to the matter on a subsequent occasion, and expressly stated that even when the war came to an end the ordinary expenditure would not permit the remission of the additional taxation. The right hon. Gentleman in 1901 said—

> "I have never stated that in my belief the expenditure of this country can be reduced. I have said it might have to be increased, and therefore we must strengthen the basis of our existing indirect taxation."

and the right hon. Gentleman went on to say—

> "It is perfectly clear that in now asking that the duties shall be continued I am breaking no promise."

I pass from that to the speech of the hon. Member for Barnstaple, who I see is not in his place. His speech, interesting as it was, constituted a curious comment on the action of hon. Members opposite with regard to the serious business of this country. I have been fiercely attacked this afternoon for wishing insidiously by a slight readjustment of the tobacco duties, to introduce the heretical principles of protection. I have been accused of infringing the sacred doctrine of free trade. Yet Gentlemen opposite, who voted in favour of the Customs duty on foreign beer and spirits, are now going to vote against the corresponding Excise duty on home-made beer and spirits. Hon. Members opposite go on to say that we are incapable of dealing with the temperance question, because we are too much in the hands of the distiller and the brewer, and yet these temperance advocates are ready, without a word of explanation, to go into the Lobby and vote for a reduction in the duty of spirits, and to translate free food into free drinks. Then the hon. Gentleman the Member for Barnstaple, in his philosophic justification of that attitude, said they were only applying the constitutional rule of refusing supplies to a Government in which they have no confidence. But the fact is that Supply has already been voted by this House, and the hon. Member is only seeking to refuse the means of paying the Bill. He says he will vote against any and every tax without reference to the merits if only he can thereby displace the present undeserving Government. Having secured that object, he will be prepared to-morrow to vote black what to-night he has declared to be white; and he is, in fact, ready to treat all the interests and trades of the country as mere pawns in the lowest form of Party game. The discussion would not have been complete without that very frank exposition of the policy of the Opposition, and I shall be curious to see whether right hon. Gentlemen on the Front Opposition Bench are prepared to treat the great interests of trade and finance on the principles laid down by the hon. Member for Barnstaple.

Mr. WHITLEY said the right hon. Gentleman had forgotten that the greatest interest of the trade of this country was to get the present Government out of office. Hon. Members on the Opposition Benches were most anxious to divide on this Resolution, and would have done so before the interesting flow of eloquence which followed the entrance of the hon. Members for Peckham and the Brightside Division of Sheffield. The right hon. Gentleman himself had sought to fill up the time until his cohorts could be brought up, but he was under a delusion if he thought the Opposition's idea in seeking an early division was to defeat the Government. What they wanted was to get to the next Resolution in which they were far more interested. He was sorry the right hon. Gentleman had thought it necessary to waste so much of the time of the House with his lecture on temperance.

MR. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.) said the Chancellor of the Exchequer had made some very pointed remarks as to the attitude of hon. Members on the Opposition Benches, but that attitude was justified by the necessity for getting rid of an Opportunist Government—a Government that was double-minded, double-faced, and double-tongued.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 206; Noes, 146. (Division List No. 109.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Allhusen, Augustus Hen. Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arnold-Forster, Rt.Hn.Hugh O
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt.Hn.Sir H.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt.Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bowles, T.Gibson(King's Lynn
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J.A(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Rt.Hn.Sir John C. R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Crooks, William
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies, Sir H. D. (Chatham)
Denny, Colonel
Dewar, Sir T.R.(Tower Hamlets
Dickson, Charles Scott
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt.Hn.Sir William Hart
Ellice, Capt E.C(SAndrw'sBghs
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Forster, Henry William
Foster, P. S. (Warwick S.W.)
Fyler, John Arthur
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Gordon, Hn.J.E.(Elgin&Nairn)
Gordon, Maj. E.(T'r Hamlets)
Gore, Hn G.R.C.Ormsby-(Salop
Gore, Hon. S.F.Ormsby-(Linc.)
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hamilton, Marq of(L'nd'nderry
Harris, F.Leverton (Tynem'th)
Harris, Dr. Fredk. R. (Dulwich
Harwood, George
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Heath, A. Howard (Hanley)
Heath, James (Staffords., N.W.
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F(Sheffield, Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hutton, John (Yorks., N.R.)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Knowles, Sir Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Jos. (Monmouth
Lawson, J. Grant (Yorks., N.R
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage.
Leveson-Gower, Frederick
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham.
Long, Rt. Hon. W. (Bristol, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lucas, Reginald J.(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Calmont, Colonel James
M'Iver, Sir Lewis(Edinburgh W.
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell, Rt.HnSir H.E(Wigt'n
Maxwell, W.J.H. (Dumfriessh.
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt.Hn.Sir Frederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Nicholson, William Graham
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Peel, Hn.Wm.Robert Wellesley
Pierpoint, Robert
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, Hon. M.W.(Stalybridge
Ridley, S.Forde(Bethnal Green
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sandys, Lt.-Col. Thos. Myles
Saunderson, Rt.Hn.Col. Edw.J
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Shackleton, David James
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford, East)
Smith, H C(North'mb.Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanark.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Hon. Arthur(Ormskirk
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart

Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C.E.H(Sheff'ld)
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A.C.E(Taunton
Welby, Sir Chas. G. E. (Notts.)
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W.H.(Yorks.
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E.R.(Bath
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES, Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles
Asher, Alexander
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Brigg, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Crean, Eugene
Crombie, John William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan)
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Evans, Sir F. H. (Maidstone
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Ffrench, Peter
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Gilhooly, James
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herb. John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Lewis V.(Rossendale
Hayden, John Patrick
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kilbride, Denis
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.
Leese, Sir Jos. F. (Accrington)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mooney, John J.
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nolan, Col. J. P. (Galway, N.)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J
Partington, Oswald
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Priestley, Arthur
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Roche, John
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C.R(Northants
Stevenson, Francis S.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E)
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Jn. Cathcart (Orkney)
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Woodhouse, Sir J.T(Huddersf'd
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE NOES, Sir Thomas Esmonde and Captain Donelan.

Third Resolution, "That it is expedient to amend the Law relating to the National Debt, Customs, and Inland Revenue," further considered:—

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution."

MR. DALZIEL asked whether this Resolution was intended to cover the proposal with regard to unclaimed dividends.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said that the clause necessary for that purpose would be included in the Finance Bill.

MR. DALZIEL thought Members were entitled to protest against the departure of the right hon. Gentleman in appropriating a portion of the unclaimed dividends. It was true that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had quoted as a precedent the course taken by Mr. Gladstone many years ago, but there was really no analogy between the two occasions, inasmuch as Mr. Gladstone used the money for the reduction of debt, whereas it was now being taken for the purposes of revenue. The right hon. Gentleman was practically selling an asset, and was thereby setting a precedent which would doubtless be followed by future Chancellors of the Exchequer who did not care to face the odium of imposing necessary taxation. The support now being given to the right hon. Gentleman would be a direct instigation to other right hon. Gentlemen to raid not only the unclaimed dividends but also the unclaimed balances. Only the gravest national emergency could justify the course proposed, and the House were entitled to a full defence of the revolutionary action of the right hon. Gentleman. Of all the proposals of the Budget this was the most objectionable, inasmuch as it set a bad precedent which was bound to be followed. No real cause had been shown for departing from the rules which generally governed the Chancellor of the Exchequer in placing his annual proposals before Parliament. For these reasons he thought he was justified in opposing the Resolution.

MR. WHITLEY hoped the right hon. Gentleman would further explain this question, as he was unable to understand from his Budget speech exactly how the matter stood. What he desired to know was, how the account stood as regarded both capital and dividends before this raid, and what the result would be afterwards. He agreed with the right hon. Gentleman in taking the money, because it was absurd to allow the accounts to run on for ever when any claim upon it was out of the question, but he contended that the money should go to the reduction of debt and not to meet a deficit in revenue. The right hon. Gentleman had prided himself on not having raided the Sinking Fund, but by this means he was indirectly doing the same thing. He hoped a full explanation of the matter would be given on the present occasion.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said the facts of the case were very simple, and if hon. Members had only read carefully his remarks on the subject in his Budget speech they would have been in no doubt as to the nature of the proposal. Unclaimed stock after a period of ten years was transferred to the National Debt Commissioners, together with the dividends which had accrued upon it. Those dividends, with the dividends subsequently accruing, were invested by the Commissioners and formed the Unclaimed Dividend Account. The liabilities of that account were for the dividends which had accrued—that was, the simple interest on the amount of stock originally transferred—but as the dividends themselves were invested the fund accumulated at compound interest, and, consequently, the fund was always making a profit and creating an asset in excess of its liabilities. That would be the case even though its nominal liabilities were the same thing as its practical liabilities. But as no stock was transferred until it had been unclaimed for ten years and every effort to trace its owner had failed, the House would see that to the greater part of the money there would never be any claim at all. Accordingly there was not only an actual excess of assets over liabilities, but there was also the amount by which the nominal liability exceeded any liability which was ever likely to be enforced. When Mr. Gladstone dealt with the fund in 1863, the assets amounted to £3,087,375 in 3 per cents., with nominal liabilities of £804,509. Mr. Gladstone cancelled the whole of the £3,000,000 of stock, leaving assets amounting to £87,375 in 3 per cents. against the nominal liabilities of £804,509, and no inconvenience had ever arisen from the operation. The amount paid from the fund in the course of the year averaged between £4,000 and £5,000. The assets at present, though not as large as in Mr. Gladstone's time, exceeded the liabilities—including both the liability of Mr. Gladstone's day and that which had accrued since—and if there was not much prospect in Mr. Gladstone's day of the nominal liability being turned into an actual liability, the chances of such an event now were considerably smaller.

SIR JOHN BRUNNER (Cheshire, Northwich) asked whether the fund had been dealt with since 1863.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN replied that it had not. The assets at the present time amounted to £1,864,309. What was the effect on the fund of Mr. Gladstone's operation compared with his own? Mr. Gladstone cancelled £3,000,000 of stock and left £87,375 3 per cent. stock. He now proposed to realise stock to the value of £1,000,000, and to leave stock to the value of £642,000; that was to say, after Mr. Gladstone's operation the remaining assets were 13·5 per cent. of the liabilities, while, if his proposals were approved, the assets when the operation was carried out would be 37·4 per cent. of the liabilities.

SIR JOHN BRUNNER asked what was the difference between cancelling and realising.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said that was the point he was coming to. Mr. Gladstone wrote off the liability. He did not actually destroy it. It remained; and if the assets he left over had proved insufficient, the liability would have fallen on the Consolidated Fund. He now proposed to realise an asset standing to the credit of this fund and to pay it into the balance at the bank. Was there much difference between reducing the overdraft at one's bank and adding to one's balance? Surely the effect of the two operations was very much the same. Mr. Gladstone did not reduce the liability but he wrote off the liability.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: But he cancelled the debt.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said that was so, but the liability remained and if the fund had not proved sufficient the State's obligation remained just the same. The mere fact that Mr. Gladstone cancelled the debt did not release the State from any obligation it was under. Mr. Gladstone cancelled the stock, leaving the liability unchanged to provide money to repay dividends if ever a claimant made good his case. In the present case he did not propose to cancel the debt, but to add to the balance at the bank, and he could not imagine a more prudent or a wiser policy in present circumstances. Hon. Gentlemen opposite were under some misapprehension because they appeared to suppose that he was financing the present year by this means. In addition to providing for the anticipated deficit of this year, he had to provide for the realised or the inherited deficit of last year. That had been temporarily met by a draft on the Exchequer balances; and he proposed to replace that draft to the extent of £1,000,000 from the unclaimed dividends. That was the only way in which he could deal with that realised deficit. He would not have been justified in proposing fresh taxation for a single year for the purpose of making good the whole of the realised deficit, and certainly, had he done so, he would not have received the support of hon. Gentlemen opposite. He did not think it possible to have adopted a more prudent or a less irksome course.

*SIR HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.) said he did not propose to follow the right hon. Gentleman in the proposal which he had just explained to the House, because he did not think that this was the proper time or that they were in a position to discuss it. He interposed at this stage because he had a sort of personal responsibility with reference to the insertion of this Resolution in the Budget every year. For a long time it was the rule to pass this as a general Resolution at the end of the Budget Resolutions in order to enable private Members to propose clauses in the Finance Bill affecting the National Debt, the Customs, and the Inland Revenue. One of the predecessors of the Chancellor of the Exchequer proposed to omit this general Resolution. The alteration was resisted by the House and was then withdrawn. No doubt the right hon. Gentleman would insert in the Finance Bill his exact proposal with reference to the £1,000,000 of unclaimed dividends, and when the Bill was in Committee the time would arrive for the discussion of that proposal. In the circumstances nothing was to be gained by opposition to the Resolution.

*Mr. McCRAE (Edinburgh, E.) said that whatever might be the merit of the Resolution, he thought the House should take every opportunity of protesting against the course which the Chancellor of the Exchequer was following with regard to the deficit of last year. He agreed that the right hon. Gentleman was providing for the estimated deficit of this year out of taxation, but what was his proposal with regard to the £1,000,000 of unclaimed dividends? He was introducing a new system entirely in this respect; he was taking money which had formerly been applied to the reduction of debt, and he was applying it to purposes for which taxation ought to have been imposed. This £1,000,000 was to be applied to wiping out the deficit of last year. The right hon. Gentleman had borrowed the whole of the money for his deficit of last year out of the Exchequer balances and therefore the greater part of it was borrowed money. Supposing the right hon. Gentleman got this £1,000,000 to strengthen his balances, what position would those balances be in after he had added this £1,000,000 to them? The balances, in 1899, the last year before the war, were £8,000,000 sterling and they were now £4,000,000, and even with the additional money from these unclaimed dividends the Exchequer balances would only then amount to £5,000,000 as against £8,000,000 sterling in 1899. What he wished to impress upon the House was that this proposal was part of a general policy to meet the deficit of last year by borrowing for the whole of it. It was now proposed to take £1,000,000 from the unclaimed dividends which had hitherto gone to the reduction of debt, and what right had the right hon. Gentleman to say that he was going to meet the deficit of last year out of any realised surplus for this year? The Chancellor of the Exchequer knew very well that realised surpluses also went to the reduction of the National Debt. Therefore he maintained that this proposal was only another way of doing what the right hon. Gentleman's predecessor did in 1899, namely, raiding the Sinking Fund instead of proposing taxation. The result was that the National Debt to-day was £135,000,000 more than it was in 1899. Last year, although they were told that the Sinking Fund contributed £5,149,000 to the reduction of debt, still their national indebtedness last year, taking into account the £3,000,000 due from the Transvaal, was only reduced £3,800,000. If they took away the £3,000,000 from the Transvaal, then their national indebtedness last year was only reduced by £800,000. They might just as well adopt the principle in force on the Continent and borrow money to meet their current expenses. The whole system was pernicious, and the House ought to take every opportunity of protesting against it. It appeared to him that, in addition to Chinese labour in the Transvaal, they were having Chinese finance at home.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES pointed out that this Resolution was necessary in order to enable hon. Members to deal with matters of finance which were not submitted to the House in the Resolutions. What this Resolution did was to extend the purview and the capacity for alteration and amendment to that part of the system of national finance which was not included in the Finance Bill of the year. He did not think there was any need for the Chancellor of the Exchequer to defend his conduct in taking the £1,000,000 from the fund which he held to meet possible claims for unpaid dividend. His case was quite as complete as was that of Mr. Gladstone when he performed the same operation. But he made a serious error in departing from the example of Mr. Gladstone. When Mr. Gladstone took £3,000,000 he cancelled £3,000,000 of debt, and relieved the State for ever from the payment of dividend on that sum. Were the right hon. Gentleman to follow that example, he would relieve the State for ever from the payment of 2½ per cent on £1,000,000, and that would be the proper way, and the only proper way, of dealing with the money. When a part of the debt was cancelled the liability to pay the perpetual annuity disappeared for ever, and that was the difference. If the Chancellor of the Exchequer had cancelled this £1,000,000 of debt, the liability to pay the perpetual dividends on that sum would have been extinguished, but as he had taken the £1,000,000 and spent it, the liability to pay the dividends would continue. He thought that was a very important difference, and to that extent he did not think it was the right way of dealing with it.

*SIR JOHN LENG (Dundee) said the Chancellor of the Exchequer had stated that every means had been taken to ascertain claimants for the dividends. It had been over and over again urged in this House and elsewhere that the names of those to whom this money was due should be periodically advertised, and he had never heard any sufficient reason why that plan had not been adopted. In connection with the savings banks in Scotland very large sums had been returned to claimants as the result of publishing the names. In Canada and Australia there was a systematic—he believed annual — publication of the names of people who had funds invested in the public banks. There was reason to believe not only that Government stocks were unclaimed but that joint stock banks also possessed large unclaimed balances. When he first came to the House, he session after session put Questions on this matter, but he found that no impression could be made. The Chancellor of the Exchequer seemed to think it was his duty to stand between the public and the banks and the Government in this matter. He assured the right hon. Gentleman that out of doors there would be a large amount of dissatisfaction as to the appropriation by the Government of £1,000,000 not belonging to them, but belonging to the successors of the people who originally deposited this money, whom, it was believed, no adequate means had been taken to discover. On that ground alone he protested against this appropriation.

SIR JAMES JOICEY (Durham, Chester-le-Street) said there was a great laxity and negligence in the efforts made to discover the owners of these unclaimed dividends, and he could speak of this from his own experience. He happened to be a trustee of a certain amount invested in Consols, and several years ago he received the interest upon these Consols. But, when once making up the accounts, he discovered that the interest was missing for one half-year. He immediately set to work to ascertain how this had happened, and he discovered at the Bank of England that the usual warrant had been addressed instead of to "Longhirst" to "Langhirst," the "o" being turned into an "a," and no effort was made to discover him in Northumberland. Whatever might be said by hon. Members of his not being known in the House, he was at any rate known in Northumberland, whether other hon. Members were known in their own counties or not. He was told at the Bank of England that there was a large file of dividend warrants and among these was found the one addressed to him. He asked the right hon. Gentleman to consider whether it was a proper proceeding to leave these dividend warrants lying there? He maintained that there was not any effort whatever made to discover to whom they were due, and he protested against the Chancellor of the Exchequer taking possession of this £1,000,000 of unclaimed dividends, because he was satisfied that if proper precaution was used and some care was taken the owners would be found.

*MR. MARTIN (Worcestershire, Droitwich) said he had always found the greatest facilities given to him by the Bank of England in connection with any financial transactions he had had with it. He had often had amounts due to him which he should never have recovered but for the extreme courtesy and care which the Bank of England had given to these matters. He supported the proposal of the Chancellor of the Exchequer with respect to these unclaimed balances, and he thought he had made it quite clear that if the money which he proposed to appropriate ever found a claimant who made good his claim, that claimant would get his money.

MR. LEVY (Leicestershire, Loughborough) asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he was going to sell in the open market. If that was not so, he should be glad to know what the right hon. Gentleman meant by realisation, for at present it was not quite clear. It must be perfectly clear that if he realised in the open market he would have a double liability—the liability which attached to the money if it should at any time be claimed by the owner, and also the permanent liability of paying dividend on the shares to whomsoever they might be sold. By the system adopted by Mr. Gladstone, there could only be one responsibility. It would be only fair to the House that the right hon. Gentleman should give a clear and definite reply as to how he proposed to deal with this large sum, because he thought there was some confusion in the minds of many. It seemed to him that the right hon. Gentleman was going to create a new liability by selling the stock and still retaining the liability which he said Mr. Gladstone retained by the cancellation.

Sir JOHN BRUNNER said the right hon. Gentleman had told them that he was about to realise these Consols. He understood that he was going to sell them in the open market. If the Consols were sold in the open market he supposed they would only produce their market value, but the right hon. Gentleman would remain liable for £100. Mr. Gladstone's operation was a perfectly simply one. He cancelled the stock and there was an end of the matter. What was the difference between cancellation and realisation?

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said that he hoped none of the stock would be sold in the open market, but that the National Debt Commissioners would be able to provide the sums which the Exchequer wished to raise. The liability of the State to a possible claimant was limited to an annuity calculated at the rate of 2½ per cent., and not for the market value of the stock to be sold.

*Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL (Yorkshire, Cleveland) said the position was now perfectly clear, but it turned out to be a very remarkable position. Apparently there was an amount of £1,000,000 in the hands of the Treasury on the unclaimed dividends account and that was to be sold to the National Debt Commissioners and the money put into the Exchequer balances. Where would the National Debt Commissioners get their money from to buy that stock? Obviously the money voted for the Sinking Fund. The House had to vote some £6,000,000 for the Sinking Fund, and out of that £1,000,000 was to be taken to buy this stock and to be used by the Chancellor of the Exchequer for last year's deficit. And yet the right hon. Gentleman would have them believe that he was not meeting his deficit out of borrowed moneys. He was precisely in the position of the lady who declared with great pride that she had been able to borrow money enough to pay off all her debts.

Mr. LOUGH said the hon. Member for King's Lynn had made the matter perfectly clear to his mind. [Laughter.] He questioned whether the hon. Members opposite who laughed understood it. The right hon. Gentleman had instanced Mr. Gladstone's operation as a parallel to his own, but it was not a fair illustration of the very doubtful transactions we were having in these days. What Mr. Gladstone did was the only possible thing that could be done, according to consistent finance, with these unclaimed dividends. He absolutely extinguished the liability of the State with regard to them, as was clearly pointed out by the hon. Member opposite. What the present Chancellor of the Exchequer proposed to do was as far removed from what Mr. Gladstone did as one pole from another. The hon. Member said that the Chancellor of the Exchequer ought to have put on more taxation. He did not like taxation at all, and he was going to persistently oppose all the new taxes. There was another alternative. The Chancellor of the Exchequer ought to have reduced expenditure. Then he would have been able to make his accounts balance without resorting to doubtful expedients.

*Mr. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty) said cancellation and realisation were two very different things. In cancellation they got rid of the liability for ever. The Chancellor of the Exchequer proposed to realise these Consols at a time when they were moving up, in order that he might add to his balance at his bankers. If Consols were going up, why should not the right hon. Gentleman wait for a better price? What occasion was there for hurry-skurry in this matter? The right hon. Gentleman did not tell them what efforts had been made to find owners for the unclaimed dividends. From experience he knew how tenaciously the right hon. Gentleman held on to what he had got. There is a saying that the Scotch father advised his son to keep the Sabbath and all he could lay his hands on. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had, no doubt, regarded that advice most religiously. There was no evidence that the right hon. Gentleman's Department took any steps to return money which had come into its possession, whether legally entitled to it or not. The right hon. Gentleman should tell the House clearly and distinctly what steps had been taken to find out the owners of the unclaimed dividends. Was any list of owners of these unclaimed dividends published? Would the Chancellor of the Exchequer grant a Return of them every year or every three years?

*Mr. AINSWORTH said he would ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer to guarantee that these Consols would be cancelled and a corresponding reduction be made in the National Debt. If the right hon. Gentleman consulted any banker in the city he would obtain exactly the same statement of the position as he had got from that side of the House.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford) said that he, for once in his life, found himself in complete agreement with the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Wolverhampton. This Resolution, if passed, would not give the sanction of the House to the proposals of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. It was a Resolution for the protection of the rights of the House; and as one who desired to discuss the Budget proposals fully in Committee, he would vote for the Resolution.

Question put, and agreed to.

Ordered, That it be a further Instruction to the Gentlemen appointed to bring in a Bill upon the Resolution reported from the Committee of Ways and Means on the 26th day of April last, and then agreed to by the House, that they do make provision therein pursuant to the said Resolution.—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

FINANCE BILL.

"To grant certain Duties of Customs and Inland Revenue, to alter other Duties, and to amend the Law relating to Customs and Inland Revenue and the National Debt, and to make other provisions for the financial arrangements of the year," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed.[Bill 176.]

Mr. LOUGH asked if the right hon. Gentleman could say when the Second Reading of the Finance Bill would be taken.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said that the Second Reading would be put down for some day before Whitsuntide.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND said he hoped that the right hon. Gentleman would give sufficient time for the discussion of the Bill at its various stages.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said that that was a matter for the Leader of the House.

PROVISIONAL ORDER (MARRIAGES) BILL.

[Second Reading.]

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. LOUGH (Islington, W.) said he appealed to the Government not to press their advantage too far, and he hoped the adjournment of the House would now be moved.

*The UNDER-SECRETARY of STATE for the HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. Cochrane, Ayrshire, N.) said that he hoped the House would allow the Bill to be read a second time. Marriages Legalisation Bills had been passed unanimously by the House on former occasions. All denominations in the House were agreed as to the necessity of it; and the Provisional Order System would keep the control of the House over the legalisation of informalities of marriage.

Mr. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs) said that it would be remembered that three years ago it was possible to raise a very important and far-reaching question in regard to this particular Bill. There was no particular schedule attached to this Bill as there had been to former Bills. As it stood, the Bill gave very large powers to the Secretary of State to make valid marriages which appeared to be invalid, because they were solemnised under certain informalities. The danger of a Bill of this kind was that while absolutely dealing with a general question, special influence might be brought to bear to use the Bill, when it became an Act, to deal with one particular case. That had occurred some years ago. He begged to move that the debate be now adjourned.

Mr. Speaker, being of opinion that the Motion was an abuse of the Rules of the House, declined to propose the Question thereupon to the House.

Question again proposed.

Mr. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid.) said he thought that the debate would adjourn itself naturally very soon. The reason for introducing a public Bill of this kind every year was the relationship of the Church of England to the marriage laws of the State. Certain formalities had to be gone through before the solemnisation of marriages, such as the proclamation of banns, and the licensing by the Bishop of the church where the proclamation of banns was made. Such was the disorder in the Church of England, that cases frequently occurred where marriages had been celebrated without the requirements of the law being observed, and these marriages were illegal. Such a Bill as this was necessary to legalise such marriages.

And, it being Midnight, the debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed to-morrow.

FOREIGN SHIPS (APPLICATION OF STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS).

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire to what extent the Statutory Requirements applying to British ships trading to and from ports in the United Kingdom should be made applicable to Foreign vessels trading to and from such ports."—(*Mr. Gerald Balfour.*)

And, it being after Midnight, and objection being taken to further Proceeding, the debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed to-morrow.

Adjourned at four minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 4th May, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Victoria University of Manchester Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment.

Chesterfield Corporation (Tramways and Improvements) Bill [Lords]; Preston and Blackburn Tramways Bill [Lords]. Read a second time, and committed.

Liverpool and London and Globe Insurance Company [Stamp Duties]. Resolution reported—"That in lieu of the Stamp Duties which would have been payable upon the deeds or assurances which, in case the Bill had not been passed into an Act, would have been required to pass to and vest in the Company certain property, there be charged a stamp duty of five pounds, and such duty shall be impressed upon the certificate to be given by the Registrar of Joint Stock Companies under the third section hereof."

Resolution agreed to.

Ordered, That it be an Instruction to the Committee on the Liverpool and London and Globe Insurance Company Bill [Lords] that they have power to make provision therein pursuant to the said Resolution.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 1). Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board for Ireland relating to the Urban Districts of Blackrock, Clonmel, Dalkey, Killiney and Ballybrack, Kingstown, Nenagh, Pembroke, Rathmines and Rathgar, Templemore, and Thurles, and the Counties of Dublin, Tipperary (North Riding), and Tipperary (South Riding); ordered to be brought in by Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland and Mr. Wyndham.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill. "To confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board for Ireland relating to the Urban Districts of Blackrock, Clonmel, Dalkey, Killiney and Ballybrack, Kingstown, Nenagh, Pembroke, Rathmines and Rathgar, Templemore, and Thurles, and the Counties of Dublin, Tipperary (North Riding), and Tipperary (South Riding)" presented, and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 177.]

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 2). Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board for Ireland relating to the Bangor and Newtownards and the County of Cork United Districts and the Ports of New Ross and Waterford; ordered to be brought in by Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland and Mr. Wyndham.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill. "To confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board for Ireland relating to the Bangor and Newtownards and the County of Cork United Districts and the Ports of New Ross and Waterford," presented, and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 178.]

Education Board Provisional Orders, (Cardiff and Newport (Monmouthshire) (by Order). Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Education, under Sections 17 (7) and 21 of The Education Act, 1902, relating to the county boroughs of Cardiff and Newport (Monmouthshire); ordered to be brought in by Sir William Anson and Mr. Victor Cavendish.

Education Board Provisional Orders, (Cardiff and Newport (Monmouthshire) Bill. "To confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Education, under Sections 17 (7) and 21 of The Education Act, 1902, relating to the county boroughs of Cardiff and Newport (Monmouthshire);" presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 179.]

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

PETITIONS.

DATYE, VAMAN VISHNU.

Petition of Vaman Vishnu Datye, for redress of grievances; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions for alteration; from Sutherland; and Comrie; to lie upon the Table.

LICENCES (RENEWAL.)

Petitions against alteration of law; from Hetton le Hole (two); Kilgerran; Leicester; North Lancashire; Murton; Sunbury; Port Isaac; Saltney Ferry (two); North Pembroke and South Cardigan; Henry's Moat; Saundersfoot; Nottingham; Stockton on Tees; Grangetown; Ilkeston; Stalybridge; Brymberian and Velindre; Houghton le Spring; Calver; Sheffield; Burslem; Lewes; Lynton; Walton; Leeds; Boncath; Silvertown; Woolwich; Preston; Rawtenstall; Chorley; Haslingden; Belper; Barrowford (two); Nelson; Ilfracombe; and Bideford; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions against; from Mile End; Aberdeen, Eccles; East Ham (two); Grimsby; Forest Hill; Llanhilleth; Cramlington; Seaton Delaval (two); Dundee; Carlisle; Mickley; Greenhead; Jesmond; North Seaton; Prudhoe; Haltwhistle; Farnworth; New York; Wylam; Widdrington; Harley; Newmarket; Leicester; and Chiswick; to lie upon the Table.

MERCHANDISE MARKS BILL.

Petition of the Scottish Trade Protection Society, against; to lie upon the Table.

RE-VACCINATION BILL.

Petition from Westminster, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF BUTTER BILL.

Petition of the Scottish Trade Protection Society, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

ANKYLOSTOMIASIS.

Copy presented, of Report to the Secretary of State for the Home Department, by A. E. Boycott, esquire, M.B. B.Sc. on the diagnosis of Ankylostoma infection, with special reference to the examination of the Blood [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

NATIONAL DEBT.

Copy presented, of Return showing (1) the Aggregate Gross Liabilities of the State as represented by the Nominal Funded Debt, Estimated Capital Liability in respect of Terminable Annuities, Unfunded Debt, and other Liabilities in respect of Debt, the Estimated Assets, and the Exchequer Balances, at the close of each financial year from 1835–6 to 1903–4, both inclusive; and (2) the Gross and Net Expenditure, charged annually during that period, against the Public Revenue, on account of the National Debt, and other payments connected with Capital Liabilities (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper [C. 1581] of Session 1903) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PUBLIC WORKS (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 26th April, 1904, authorising the sale of a portion of foreshore near the old Harbour of Dunleary, not required for the purposes of Kingstown Harbour [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1884.

Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 29th April, 1904, declaring that George Hadfield, Fitter Marker-out, Royal Carriage Department, War Office, was appointed without a Civil Service Certificate through inadvertence on the part of the Head of his Department [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

RAILWAY ACCIDENTS.

Copy presented, of Returns of Accidents and Casualties as reported to the Board of Trade by the several Railway Companies in the United Kingdom during the year ended 31st December, 1903, together with Reports of the Inspecting Officers of the Railway Department to the Board of Trade, upon certain Accidents which were inquired into [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Post Office Night Messengers in Scotland.

MR. LEVESON-GOWER (Sutherland): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he has considered the position of the night messengers employed in the principal telegraph offices in Scotland with regard to salary and pension; and, if so, what decision he has come to.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) I have considered the question of the pay of the night telegraph messengers employed at the principal offices in Scotland, and I see no reason for increasing it. As these posts are unestablished, their occupants are not eligible for pension.

Postal Cash-on-Delivery System.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he has yet arrived at a determination with regard to the proposed cash-on-delivery post; and, if so, whether he will inform the House of his decision.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) I must refer the hon. Member to the Answer I gave yesterday† to the Question on this subject.

Opening of Road from Duke of York's Steps to Charing Cross.

SIR HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.): To ask the hon. Member for Chorley, as representing the First Commissioner of Works, when does he expect the road from the Duke of York's Steps to Charing Cross will be completed; and whether he would give directions for a temporary footpath from The Mall into Charing Cross to be available for pedestrians in the meantime.

(*Answered by Lord Balcarres.*) It is not possible to fix a date for the completion of the road until the plans of the Admiralty extension, now under consideration, have been determined. Should it be possible to open a footpath without danger to pedestrians during building operations the First Commissioner will be glad to consider it.

Precautions against Fire in Institutions under Government Control.

MR. H. C. RICHARDS (Finsbury, E.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if, in view of the recent fire at the Highbury Truant School and the loss of life at Eton College and Colney Hatch Asylum, he has taken, or will take, any steps to urge upon the authorities of institutions having grants from the Treasury and under Home Office inspection to provide for the unlocking of all barred windows in these institutions in the event of fire, and the provision of fire escapes therefrom, at the earliest opportunity.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) The question of means of escape in case of fire has recently received special attention as regards both institutions which come within my jurisdiction, and also, as I understand, those which fall under other Government Departments, and my hon. friend may be assured that all possible precautions are urged upon managers and other authorities and are widely adopted, whether by the removal of window bars, the provision of special means of exit, or otherwise.

Legal Expenses of Ecclesiastical Commissioners.

MR. HUMPHREYS-OWEN (Montgomeryshire): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that the total legal expenses of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners have, in the ten financial years last past, amounted approximately to £107,500; and whether he will cause a Departmental inquiry to be instituted into the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) I have no power to order an inquiry in this matter, but I have consulted the Commissioners, who have been good enough to furnish me with the following information:—During the last ten years the Ecclesiastical Commissioners have sold land and other hereditaments belonging to themselves to the value of upwards of £1,880,000, and have purchased other hereditaments at a cost of more than £1,160,000. The consideration moneys for sales of glebe lands effected under the Ecclesiastical Leasing Acts administered by the Commissioners during the same period have amounted to upwards of £1,360,000 in respect of about 1,220 transactions. The income of the Commissioners' Common Fund received and dispensed by them is over £1,500,000 per annum, of which £1,250,000 is derived from real estates. In addition, as trustees under certain general and special Acts of Parliament and otherwise, the Commissioners receive and dispense a further income of about £227,000, of which £49,000 or thereabouts is derived from real estates. The Commissioners also manage episcopal estates, the revenue from which, mainly from real property, amounts to about £50,000 per annum. The protection of these large interests necessarily involves the Commissioners from time to time in legal proceedings and in opposition to schemes injurious thereto for which Parliamentary sanction is sought. The Commissioners have also administrative duties, under the Church Building Acts, New Parishes Acts, Union of Benefices Act, and other statutes, which have no relation to income or capital funds arising therefrom, but necessarily involve the employment of legal assistance. Taking these facts into consideration, the sum of £107,500 incurred during the last ten years for legal expenses, in which are included stamp duties on the abovementioned purchases of £1,160,000 and other transactions, does not appear to be excessive.

---

† See page 241.

Publication of Vivisection Returns.

DR. SHIPMAN (Northampton): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he can state when the Returns of Experiments on Living Animals in 1903 will be published; and what was the number of dogs vivisected in 1903 in University College, London.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) The Return in question is now in course of being printed, and will be published as soon as possible. It will contain the usual full particulars; but I have no material from which I can answer the second paragraph of the Question.

Registration Marks on Motor-Cars.

MR. BRIGG (Yorkshire, W.R., Keighley): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Trade if he will state the letters and marks used for the registration of motor-cars in different counties and areas.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) So far as England and Wales are concerned the information desired will be found in the First Schedule to the Order which I issued under The Motor-Car Act, 1903, with respect to the registration of motor-cars. I will send the hon. Member a copy of the Order.

Naval Speed Trials on the Cornish Coast—Damage to Fisheries.

SIR LEWIS MOLESWORTH (Cornwall, Bodmin): To ask the hon. Member for North Huntingdonshire, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether he will be prepared to send an official from the Department of Fisheries to make a Report on the possible damage to the fishing interests on the south coast of Cornwall from the proposal to hold naval speed trials on the drift-net fishing grounds near the shore; and whether he will be prepared to lay a Report upon the Table.

(*Answered by Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.*) My noble friend the President of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries has been in communication with the First Lord of the Admiralty on this subject. He is prepared to give the First Lord such advice as to any possible injury to the fishing interest as the Department is able to give, but in all probability experience alone will show whether there is any ground for the fears which have been expressed. Any question of damage to boats or gear would be dealt with by the Board of Trade, and not by the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries.

Local Loans under the Public Loans Act.

MR. BRIGG: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he will furnish the total of the amounts of the loans which have been made by Government under the Public Loans Act to different local authorities and individuals, and the amounts which it is proposed to remit this year.

(*Answered by Mr. Victor Cavendish.*) The local loans advanced up to the 31st March, 1903, amounted to £167,989,216. The principal sums still outstanding in respect of those loans amounted on that date to £64,044,485. Until the Public Works Loans Bill is introduced, no information can be given as to any loans which it may be proposed to remit or write off under the provisions of that Bill.

Extension of Education (Local Authority Default) Bill to Secondary Schools.

Mr. BRIGG: To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education if it is intended to extend the action of the Education (Local Authority Default) Bill to the authorities who are penalising secondary schools whose trust deeds stipulate that distinctive religious instruction shall be given in the schools, and that the head-master shall avow belief in certain religious beliefs.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) The Education (Local Authority Default) Bill applies only to elementary schools, and there is no intention of extending its operation to secondary schools.

Issue of Remainder of Transvaal Guaranteed Loan.

Sir EDGAR VINCENT (Exeter): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer when it was proposed to issue the remaining £5,000,000 of the Transvaal Guaranteed Loan.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) The actual date of this issue must depend both upon the financial condition of the Transvaal and the state of the money market here; but there is no intention of making any issue at present.

Annual Return of National Debt.

Mr. BUCHANAN (Perthshire, E.): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he will arrange that the Annual Return relating to the National Debt is in the hands of Members before the Second Reading of the Finance Bill.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) The Return is now in the printer's hands.

Army Candidates—Leaving and Qualifying Certificates.

Sir CARNE RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will consider the effect to Army candidates if the distinciion between leaving and qualifying certificates is maintained; and whether all candidates can be subjected to the same examination (preliminary), and receive certificates of the same value.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) The rules referred to were drawn up on the recommendation of the Advisory Board on Education after very full consideration. I am not prepared to make any alteration in the rules until they have been given a fair trial. They will be carefully watched, and if any amendments are found necessary they will be carried out.

Output of Gold in the Transvaal—Kaffirs Employed.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies what was the monthly output of gold in the Transvaal (in ounces and in pounds sterling) on the following dates; each month of 1897 separately and of each month of 1898 separately; what was the number of Kaffirs employed in the Transvaal mines in January and in July respectively of 1897, and in January and in July of 1898; and what was the number of Kaffirs similarly employed in each of the months from July, 1903, to December, 1903, inclusive.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*)

Witwatersrand Gold Mines.

			Value.
	ozs.	dwts.	£
1897—			
January	209,832	1	728,138
February	211,000	13	728,498
March	232,066	19	805,032
April	235,698	19	821,912
May	248,305	8	867,844
June	251,529	6	877,834
July	242,478	16	845,458
August	259,603	1	904,681
September	262,151	0	917,082
October	274,175	9	960,010
November	297,124	10	1,041,903
December	310,712	9	1,085,224
Total	3,034,678	11	10,583,616
Other Districts	255,041	11	4,892,644
Total Transvaal	3,289,720	2	11,476,260

Witwatersrand Gold Mines.

		Value.
1898—	ozs. dwts.	£
January	313,826 13	1,096,859
February	297,975 17	1,042,572
March	325,907 19	1,140,611
April	335,125 3	1,177,293
May	344,160 10	1,211,765
June	344,670 13	1,211,673
July	359,343 17	1,264,833
August	376,911 19	1,330,666
September	384,080 0	1,358,609
October	400,791 0	1,417.780
November	393,310 18	1,395,976
December	419,504 6	1,492,739
Total	4,295,608 15	15,141,376
Other Districts	259,413 4	902,759
Total Transvaal	4,555,021 19	16,044,135

1897. Average number of Natives employed during the year, 69,098.

1898. Average numbers employed during the year, 82,062.

(Figures for January and July do not appear to be available.)

Transvaal Gold Mines.

	Coloured persons in employ.	On last day of each month at work.
1903—		
July	68,217	61,780
August	69,688	62,705
September	70,255	62,815
October	71,659	64,968
November	72,748	65,311
December	73,622	67,396

Immigration Regulations in British Colonies.

MR. BRIGG: To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he will give the regulations, if any, which are now in force in Australia, New Zealand, Canada, and South Africa respecting the admission of immigrants.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*) I will lay a Paper containing the legislation now in force in the self-governing Colonies for which the hon. Member asks.

Flogging in the Navy.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty what is the weight of the birch supplied at the dockyards to His Majesty's ships for the flogging of boys and youths under eighteen, the strokes to be inflicted in such floggings not to exceed twenty-four; whether these birches are as a preparation for use in these floggings steeped in brine and for how long are they so steeped; whether boys and youths condemned to be flogged are confined during the night before the infliction of the flogging in cells below the water mark on bread and water, and when flogged consigned again to these cells; and, if so, whether any steps will be taken for the alteration or modification of the King's Regulations for the Navy under which it is permitted.

(*Answered by Mr. Pretyman.*) The weight of the birch is 9 ozs. The answer to the remaining part of the Question is in the negative.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Naval Paymasters-in-Chief.

MR. SKEWES-COX (Surrey, Kingston): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if the Lords of the Admiralty have declined the payment of a commuted allowance to Paymasters-in-Chief of the Royal Navy similar to that granted to certain secretaries to Commanders-in-Chief and other officers employed at the Admiralty of inferior rank; and, if so, will he state the grounds upon which such refusal is based, and whether the subject can be reconsidered.

*THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. PRETYMAN, Suffolk, Woodbridge): If the hon. Member is referring to the commuted allowance for servants, the reply is that applications for this allowance have been refused as the officers were in receipt of lodging money, the payment of which, except in unusual circumstances, covers the cost of attendance. I see no grounds for reconsidering the subject.

Duke of Norfolk's Commission on the Militia and Volunteers.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is in a position to inform the House of the probable date of the publication of the Report of the Duke of Norfolk's Commission on the Militia and Volunteers.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): I am not yet in a position to give a positive date for the publication of the Report of this Commission, but I have reason to believe that it will be ready towards the end of this month.

Reported Disturbances in British New Guinea.

THE MASTER OF ELIBANK (Edinburgh, Midlothian): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether any information has reached him regarding the recent disturbances in the Western Division of British New Guinea, involving a conflict between the natives and the Government vessel "Merrie England," and alleged loss of life amongst the former; and, if so, whether he can say if the Home or Commonwealth Governments propose to institute any inquiry in the matter.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. LYTTELTON, Warwick and Leamington): I have no information on the subject, but have asked for a report from the Governor-General of Australia.

The Tibetan Mission.

MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether the Chinese Amban and representative of the Tibetan Government have power, on reaching Gyangtse, to treat and settle the differences between India and Tibet.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): The Chinese Amban, as representing the Suzerain Power, has authority to treat with the British Mission; as to the powers of the Tibetan representative who may accompany the Amban, I have at present no information. As regards the settling of differences, no doubt references to the Governments respectively represented will be necessary.

Macedonian Gendarmerie.

MR. CHARLES ALLEN (Gloucestershire, Stroud): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the European officers of gendarmerie in Macedonia will have the power to march their men for the suppression or punishment of outrages, or will their power be limited to reporting such outrages.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Earl PERCY, Kensington, S.): We understand that in the event of disturbances of the character indicated, the European officers would receive instructions from General Giorgis and the staff, and would transmit them to the Turkish officers who will have the immediate command of the force.

MR. CHARLES ALLEN: Then they must await instructions from General Giorgis before they act?

EARL PERCY: They will not have the right to act on their own responsibility without the orders of General Giorgis.

Somaliland—The Mijertain Tribe.

Mr. LAMBERT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state the estimated strength of the Mijertain tribe now fighting with the Mullah; also the strength of the Mullah's forces; and when it is proposed to withdraw the expedition from Somaliland.

Earl PERCY: We do not know the precise number of the Mijertain tribe who are now fighting with the Mullah. In 1902 it was estimated that he might count on the active support of from 40,000 to 70,000 spears from this tribe. The last reports from General Egerton show that on 31st March he had only 600 riflemen with him. Information received by the Italian Government early in April put the number at 500. As I informed the hon. Member for East Clare on Monday last,† the question of the numerical strength of the force which it will be necessary to maintain in the Protectorate after the withdrawal of the expedition is under the consideration of His Majesty's Government, and until a final decision has been arrived at, the exact date of the withdrawal cannot be announced.

Mr. LAMBERT: Can the noble Lord say whether all the rifles and ammunition have been captured from the Mullah?

Earl PERCY: I cannot say exactly how much has been captured.

Death Duties on Licensed Property.

Mr. LAMBERT: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer what has been the average number of years purchase of licence value charged for death duty on the passing of licensed houses.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.): The records of the Inland Revenue are not kept in such a way as to enable me to answer this Question. They do not specifically separate the value of the possession of the licence from the rest of the estate.

Publicans' Licences.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he can state the proportion of publicans' licences to the population in England and Wales in the year 1880.

*The SECRETARY of STATE for the HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. Akers-Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's): The proportion appears to have been about 1 in 328 according to the figures of the census of 1871, or, taking the nearer census of 1881, 1 in 375. The figures given in my introductory statement included "on" beerhouses.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON: Can the right hon. Gentleman say what the proportion is to-day? I think he mentioned it the other day.

*Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS: I cannot recall it just now.

Paddington Butchers and the Sanitary Inspector.

Mr. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware that the sanitary inspector of the borough of Paddington is requesting butchers to submit to him a list of the pig carcases they have bought, and stating also when they expected delivery of the same, and further notifying them that the said carcases were not to be cut until he had seen them; whether such action has the sanction of the Local Government Board; and, if so, since what date has the practice been introduced.

*The PRESIDENT of the LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. Walter Long, Bristol, S.): I have made inquiry with regard to this matter, and am informed that the sanitary inspector at Paddington has not made any such requests or notification as are referred to in the Question. I understand that butchers have been informed by the inspector that he has been authorised to call at their premises to examine any carcases purchased by them from the market before they are exposed for sale, and that for this purpose they keep the inspector informed of the hours at which they expect delivery.

---

† See page 10.

Aliens in Receipt of Poor Law Relief.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL (Yorkshire, Cleveland): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether the number of 1,753 aliens who were in receipt of Poor Law relief on 1st July, 1903, included persons in receipt of medical relief; and, if so, if he will state what was the number of aliens then receiving relief other than medical, the proportion which they bore to the total alien population, and the proportion of non-aliens receiving such relief to the total non-alien population.

*MR. WALTER LONG: The 1,753 pauper aliens receiving Poor Law relief on 1st July, 1903, included persons in receipt of medical relief only. The number receiving relief other than medical relief only was 1,568. The proportion which the number of aliens receiving relief other than medical relief only bore to the total alien population according to the census of 1901 was rather over 6 per cent. The proportion which the number of paupers (excluding aliens) who on the 1st July, 1903, received relief other than medical relief only, bore to the total non-alien population according to the census of 1901 was rather over 2·4 per cent.

Canadian Cattle.

CAPTAIN ELLICE (St. Andrews Burghs): I beg to ask the hon. Member for North Huntingdonshire, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether, in the interest of the health of our herds, the Board of Agriculture can advice His Majesty's Government to remove the existing restrictions upon the importation of cattle from Canada.

MR. AILWYN FELLOWES (Huntingdonshire, Ramsey): The restrictions to which the hon. and gallant Member refers are prescribed by statute and apply to all animals imported from abroad irrespective of the country of origin. The Board of Agriculture and Fisheries have, therefore, no power to take action in the matter in the manner suggested.

Sale of Tubercular Cattle for Breeding Purposes.

CAPTAIN ELLICE: I beg to ask the hon. Member for North Huntingdonshire, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether, in view of the fact that in the city of Glasgow slaughterhouses, out of 46,784 home-bred cattle slaughtered, 6,332 were found to be tubercular, whereas out of 49,881 Canadian and United States cattle slaughtered only sixty-six were found to be so affected, he will consider the advisability of taking steps to secure that cattle which are rejected by foreign buyers for failing to pass the tuberculin test shall not be permitted to be sold to British farmers for breeding purposes.

MR. AILWYN FELLOWES: We are aware of the facts to which the hon. and gallant Member directs attention, and he may be interested to refer to the statement made on the subject by the late Mr. Hanbury in reply to a Question addressed to him by the hon. Member for Dundee in November, 1902.† So far as the Board are concerned they have no power to prohibit the sale of cattle which fail to pass the tuberculin test. It is for the purchasers of breeding stock to consider for themselves whether they will adopt the same course as that taken by many foreign buyers.

Religious Instruction in Secondary Schools.

MR. HUMPHREYS-OWEN (Montgomeryshire): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether any education authority in England or Wales has required, as a condition of making a grant to any secondary school, that any particular form of religious instruction or any religious catechism or formulary which is distinctive of any particular denomination shall not be taught, used, or practised in the school.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxv., 19.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir WILLIAM ANSON, Oxford University): The Board are only aware of one case which could be considered in any way to correspond to the circumstances described in the Question; and, from the information before the Board, it is by no means clear that the provisions of the Act have been infringed in this case.

Abusive Soldier at Longford.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether his attention has been called to the fact that, on Wednesday last, the very rev. Joseph Skelly, of Newtownforbes, was followed by a drunken soldier, who abused and threatened him on the public road and quite close to Longford (No. 2) Police Barracks; and, if so, what action he intends taking in this matter.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): A soldier named Herbert, when under the influence of drink, accosted the rev. Mr. Skelly on the occasion mentioned and used heated and offensive language towards him, being under the impression that the rev. gentleman had spoken very disparagingly of the Military at a recent meeting of the Governors of the Longford County Infirmary. The police did not witness the occurrence, but on complaint being made by Mr. Skelly they procured the name of the soldier for him and advised him to complain to the latter's commanding officer who could best deal with misconduct of this kind. I am not aware whether the rev. gentleman has done so, or whether he desires to proceed further in the matter.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): Will the right hon. and learned Gentleman say how he arrived at the "impressions" of a drunken soldier?

MR. ATKINSON: That was the excuse the drunken soldier gave.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Is it usual to quote excuses given by drunken soldiers in a case of this kind?

MR. ATKINSON: It is not usual, but it is the fact here.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: If the rev. gentleman does not wish to prosecute will the right hon. Gentleman, who knows so much of the fact, direct that action be taken against the soldier?

MR. ATKINSON: I must decline to answer a hypothetical Question.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): We may take it for granted that the soldier is not a Nationalist and therefore will not be prosecuted.

Cusack Estate, County Longford.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the present position of the sale proceedings of the Cusack Estate, county Longford; whether he is now able to give a Return showing the names of intending purchasers of this estate, and how many of same are evicted tenants or the sons of former evicted tenants on this property.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): The information desired in this Question was given in answer to the hon. Member's previous Question of 27th April.†

MR. J. P. FARRELL: Will the right hon. Gentleman impress on the Estates Commissioners the importance of dealing with this matter immediately.

MR. WYNDHAM: They are fully alive to that.

Irish Exhibits at the St. Louis Exhibition.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the general arrangements which have been made by the Department of Agriculture in Ireland for the Irish exhibit at the St. Louis Exhibition.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Department, with the concurrence of the Royal Commission, have co-operated with the Irish Exhibit Company of St. Louis in organising an industrial exhibit illustrative of

---

† *See* (4) *Debates*, cxxxiii., 1304.

Ireland's resources and of her general progress. The exhibit so organised includes the following sections:—I., General Industries; II., Home, Cottage and Art Industries; III., Education; IV., Minerals; V., Agriculture; VI., Fisheries; VII., Statistics and Intelligence; VIII., Historic Art Industries and Relics; IX., Historic Engravings, Portraits, etc. The exhibit will be displayed in a special Irish section, for which the site and buildings have been provided by the Company referred to. The response of manufacturers and others engaged in industry in the country has been very satisfactory, and, as the exhibit now stands, it will probably prove to be the most comprehensive illustration of the actual industrial conditions of Ireland that has yet been got together for an International Exhibition.

MR. KILBRIDE (Kildare, S.): Will the Vice-President's new book be exhibited there?

[No answer was returned.]

Tuam Nurse's Salary.

MR. REDDY (King's County, Birr): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received a resolution from the Tuam Board of Guardians protesting against the refusal of the Local Government Board to agree to an increase of £10 a year in the salary of Nurse O'Connor; whether he is aware that Mrs. O'Connor's district comprises 34,526 acres with a sparse population, which renders the attendance at cases all the more difficult; and, whether, seeing that a similar increase was sanctioned for a lady with 12,000 less acres to cover than Mrs. O'Connor, will he advise the Local Government Board to grant this increase.

MR. WYNDHAM: The hon. and gallant Member for North Galway had already directed my attention to this case, and I am making some inquiries on the subject, which are not yet completed. I will communicate the result of these inquiries to the hon. Member in due course.

Trinity College Lands.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the difficulty which occupiers of Trinity College lands are experiencing in purchasing their holdings, he will now state the terms of reference to the proposed Commission of Inquiry, and name the Members of the Commission.

MR. WYNDHAM: I am not yet in a position to give the terms of reference or names of members of the Commission, but expect to do so shortly.

Irish Fishing Piers.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Wexford, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what steps he proposes to take with a view to the improvement of fishing piers on the south-east coast of Ireland.

MR. WYNDHAM: I am in communication with the hon. Baronet on the subject of this Question.

Irish Technical Schools

MR. FIELD: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received a copy of a resolution from the Blackrock Technical Instruction Committee with respect to the provision of funds necessary for the erection of suitable technical schools in Ireland to be repaid on easy terms, as suggested by the deputation which waited on him in Dublin Castle; and, if so, whether he intends to take any action in this matter.

MR. WYNDHAM: The resolution has been received. I discussed this matter very fully with the deputation that waited on me in Dublin, and have no further statement to make on the matter at present.

Galloway Bulls for Ireland.

MR. FIELD: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received a resolution from the secretary of the Irish Cattle Traders' and Stock Owners' Association condemning the introduction of Galloway bulls into Ireland; and, if so, whether he will represent to the Department of Agriculture the views of those who represent the opinion of the live stock trade, and see that they are carried into effect.

MR. WYNDHAM: The selection of the breed of bulls under the Department's live stock schemes is left to local people who, unless in special circumstances, have not so far asked to be allowed to purchase bulls of the Galloway breed.

Rowe Estate, Wexford.

MR. FFRENCH (Wexford, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Rowe Estate has been in the Land Judge's Court over thirty years, that the rental was settled twenty-five years ago, and that the solicitors having carriage did nothing about having a sale until the tenants applied a week ago; and whether he can give any explanation regarding the delay.

MR. WYNDHAM: No application was made to the Land Judge on behalf of the tenants in respect of the sale of this estate. But application was made on the 19th April by the solicitors having carriage of the proceedings, and the Land Judge gave the agent permission to negotiate with the tenants for the sale of their holdings.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): But is it the fact that this case was settled twenty-five years ago, and that the solicitor in charge has not made the slightest move?

MR. WYNDHAM: He made application on the 19th April.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: After twenty-five years!

Avondale Estate, Wicklow.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state whether the Board of Agriculture and Technical Instruction (Ireland) have purchased the estate of Avondale, county Wicklow; and, if so, whether the townlands of Carrignameil and Carrignamuck, which formed part of the estate, are included in the purchase.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Department of Agriculture has purchased a portion of the Avondale Estate. I am inquiring whether the townlands mentioned are included.

Labourers' Cottage Schemes.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY (Limerick, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, if he can state whether the same expense will be incurred in the preparation of a scheme for the building of labourers' cottages under the Labourers (Ireland) Bill as under existing Acts; and, if not, in what particulars are the expenses cheapened.

MR. WYNDHAM: It is clear that considerable expense will be saved in the case of schemes for allotments where land is not to be taken compulsorily. It is hoped that under the provisions of the Bill expense will be saved in other cases. I am prepared to favourably consider any suggestion which may be made for the furtherance of this object during the stages of the Bill.

The Labourers (Ireland) Bill.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state whether the Government intend to make any further provision in the Labourers (Ireland) Bill for the building of cottages when the 1s. in the £ rate limit has been reached by the local authorities, except the Exchequer contribution; and whether, in such cases, he will take steps to have the unexpended balance of about £50,000 devoted in said Bill for the housing of the working classes with a view to checking emigration.

MR. WYNDHAM: It is not proposed to increase the present maximum rating limit. The question of the application of the unexpended balance of the Exchequer contribution is engaging consideration.

Costs attendant on Labourers' Cottage Schemes.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, whether he is aware that the costs attendant on the statement and abstract of title to the plots of land acquired under the Labourers (Ireland) Acts, and paid for by the local authorities out of the rates, amount in many cases to more than the value of the plots; and whether he has any objection to the insertion of a clause in the Labourers (Ireland) Bill by which any person in possession as owner or apparent owner of the lands, and receiving the rents and profits of same for six years or upwards, shall be entitled to the compensation without further inquiry into the title.

MR. WYNDHAM: In individual cases the fact is as stated in the first part of the Question. But a reference to the Return which I laid on the Table on the 28th April shows that the total costs of every description in connection with the last completed schemes throughout Ireland (and not merely the cost of proving title) averaged only about £8 per cottage, or about one-eighteenth of the entire cost of land, buildings, legal, engineering, and other expenses. The suggestion in the second part of the Question is already receiving consideration.

Agrarian Offences in Ireland.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the fact that in the Return of agrarian offences throughout Ireland, reported to the Constabulary for the year 1903, of the entire number of 195 not less than 83 are returned under the head of intimidation notices; and whether, in view of recent information, he will order the discontinuance of Returns under this head.

MR. WYNDHAM: The figures are correctly stated in the Question. The publication of quarterly Returns has been discontinued, but it is not proposed to discontinue the Annual Returns.

Galbraith Estate, County Tyrone.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that at the April Quarter Sessions of Longford sixty-one processes for rent were heard at the suit of the representatives of the late John S. Galbraith, of Clonebogan, county Tyrone; whether any application was made on behalf of the tenants of this estate to the Estate Commissioners to purchase the estate; and, if not, whether, as this is a congested estate within the meaning of the Act of 1903, the Commissioners will make a proposal for its purchase forthwith.

MR. WYNDHAM: No application has been made to the Commissioners to purchase this estate, either on behalf of the owner or the tenants.

MR. FARRELL: If an application is made by a solicitor on behalf of the tenants, will the Commissioners take any action?

MR. WYNDHAM: They will consider the application.

Longford Police Cells.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether any further steps have been, or are being, taken to provide sanitary places of detention for temporary prisoners in Longford (No. 1) Police Barracks; and, if so, can he state the nature of the proposed improvements.

MR. WYNDHAM: Improvements have been effected in the lock-up accommodation and in the drainage. I am making further inquiries.

Munster Dairy School.

MR. FLYNN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the recently held annual meeting of the Munster Dairy School and Agricultural Institute; and whether he can state what steps the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction propose to take in regard to the allocation of the sum of £10,000 set aside for the Munster Institute under Section 16 of the Agricultural and Technical Instruction (Ireland) Act, 1899.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Department has already applied more than half the sum referred to to the extension of the buildings at the Munster Institute and the provision of additional equipment. The new buildings, some of which have already been in use, are now on the point of completion, and arrangements for the allocation of further monies to the development of the Institute are at present under consideration.

Dublin College of Science and Art—Architect's Nationality.

MR. FIELD: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that dissatisfaction exists respecting the appointment of an English architect to act jointly with an Irish architect in the erection of the College of Science and Art in Dublin; and whether he can explain why it was necessary to import an architect, in view of the fact that competent professional men were available for the work in Ireland.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY (Mr. VICTOR CAVENDISH, Derbyshire, W.): I am not aware of any dissatisfaction on this subject. There is no Irish architect who has any experience in building a College of Science, or has especial knowledge of the intricate technical details which have to be borne in mind in constructing such a building according to modern requirements. Mr. Aston Webb has the greatest knowledge and experience of this class of work.

*MR. MOONEY (Dublin County, S.): Has not the hon. Gentleman received a copy of the resolution passed by the Institute of Irish Architects? Is it the deliberate opinion of the Treasury that there is no architect in Ireland competent to undertake this work?

MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH: I have not seen the resolution.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: The right hon. Gentleman says he is not aware of any dissatisfaction on the subject. Is he not aware of the fact that protests have been made by the representatives of Ireland in this House?

MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH: I was not aware that any resolution had been passed. I must point out that an Irish architect has also been engaged.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: But I want to know what the hon. Gentleman means by saying that he is not aware of any dissatisfaction on the matter when dissatisfaction has been emphatically expressed by the representatives of Ireland in this matter.

MR. LONSDALE: May I ask whether, in view of the dissatisfaction in Dublin, the college will be removed to Belfast.

Sale of Butter Bill.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he can state whether it is the intention of the Government to proceed with the Bill to amend the law with regard to the sale of butter; and, if so, when will the Second Reading of it be taken.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.): I cannot fix a day for the Second Reading of the Bill, but I hope it will be passed in the course of the session.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that through lack of time the Bill has failed to pass two years in succession?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Well, I hope the hon. Gentleman and his colleagues will do all they can to help me get as much time as possible.

The Port of London Bill.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis), calling attention to the following notice of Motion in the name of the President of the Board of Trade, "That proceedings upon the Port of London Bill may be resumed," said this was an entirely unprecedented Motion, and asked the Prime Minister whether it was intended that it should be decided without Amendment or debate. The right hon. Gentleman gave an undertaking to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Thanet that the Motion should not be drawn into a precedent; nevertheless the Motion made the power to take this action a Standing Order of the House, and, in case the Bill should not be proceeded with this session, he wished to know whether that Standing Order would keep this power alive for next session.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I shall not ask the House to come to a decision on this Motion to-day, but I shall ask the House to come to a decision upon it at some early day, and, parenthetically, I may remark it can be taken after midnight.

As to the larger aspects of the question, I hope my hon. friend will give me notice. I do not remember the pledge to which my hon. friend refers, but I think it must have referred to a view which I certainly hold that we ought not to draw this into a precedent for ordinary public Bills without a definite decision of the House. The Port of London Bill, however, is rather in the nature of a private Bill.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Will the right hon. Gentleman allow a debate?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not know that the matter rests with me, but if it does I shall allow as little as I can.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): Has the Prime Minister any statement to make as to the business of the House next week, and can he fix a day for the Second Reading of the Budget Bill?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The first of the Scottish Votes to be taken to-morrow will be that for the Secretary for Scotland, the second the Local Government Board, and after that Votes 28, 29, and 30, in the same class, and Vote 49, the Scottish National Gallery. On Monday I propose to take the Second Reading of the Licensing Bill, and I hope on Monday week to take the Second Reading of the Budget.

MR LONSDALE asked if Irish Estimates would be taken on Thursday week?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I understand there are difficulties in the way; but I will state definitely next Monday.

PUBLIC PETITIONS COMMITTEE.

Fifth Report brought up, and read; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

BISHOPRICS OF SOUTHWARK AND BIRMINGHAM BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order for Second Reading read.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I shall not detain the House more than a few minutes in recommending this Bill for its consideration. It is one of those Bills which from time to time are required in order to make the local organisation of the Church of England correspond to the changes in population and in the powers and facilities of locomotion which are incident to a progressive country like our own. I hope rather than believe that the House will consider such a Bill upon its merits, and will not attempt to make it an occasion for discussing questions altogether outside its scope, and which are in no sense either directly or indirectly related to any subject which can properly be raised on the Second Reading. The Bill is one of a considerable series of measures which have been found necessary in order to make it possible for the Bishops of the Church of England to carry out their duties—increasing in onerousness, as they are, day by day—by dividing and diminishing the area of their dioceses. I will not enumerate, nor is it necessary that I should, the predecessors of this Bill; but what we have to consider to-day is whether the cases of the diocese of Worcester and of the diocese of Rochester afford a sufficient ground for making a further subdivision of the diocesan system of England, and enabling the Bishops who now preside over those sees to carry out with a less overwhelming burden of labour the duties which are imposed upon them.

The diocese of Worcester comprises, as the House knows, not only Worcester, but what is known as the Black Country and the great urban centre of Birmingham. It is not expedient and it does not facilitate episcopal work to conjoin in one diocese a city like Birmingham and the other districts which are attached to it. The House has already consented to establish a bishopric of Manchester, a bishopric of Bristol, a bishopric of Newcastle, and a bishopric of Liverpool; and the precedent which, with infinite advantage, has been followed with regard to these great cities should, in our opinion, be extended also to Birmingham. The new see of Birmingham, which I hope in consequence of this Bill we shall soon see created, will include a portion of the present Lichfield diocese; but in the main it will be taken out of the present

Worcester diocese; and I am confident that the work of the Church in the diocese of Worcester will be enormously facilitated by a division of the labours now falling on one man's shoulders and laying upon those shoulders a burden almost greater than can be borne. All that can be said about Worcester can, I think, be said with increased emphasis, if that is possible, with regard to the diocese of Rochester. The diocese of Rochester as at present existing was constituted in 1875, and in that year the whole population of the present diocese amounted to about 1,600,000 persons. The division of that diocese, which by this Bill will be created, under the new bishopric of Southwark already contains a population far in excess of that which the old diocese, created in 1875, placed under the ecclesiastical supervision of the Bishop. The diocese of Southwark is a part of London which has been growing rapidly. By the last census I believe that it contained 2,000,000 persons, as against 1,600,000 which the whole diocese of Rochester contained thirty years ago. And I am confident that every man who has looked into the Church of England needs in South London will admit that this vast population does require the uninterrupted labours of a Bishop who should not be compelled to share those labours with the more ancient portion of the diocese from which at present it takes its name. It is physically impossible adequately to work from the Bishop's house at Kennington the whole Rochester diocese, which is not even a continuous area with that part of the diocese of Rochester which is in South London. At present the diocese of Rochester consists of two islands, separated by a portion of the diocese of Canterbury, and even such excuse as territorial continuity might give for continuing it under one bishopric is absent in this particular case.

But I need not labour the point that this division is necessary in both cases. There have been innumerable meetings of various kinds, diocesan and other, on the subject of the division of these bishoprics, and they have been unanimous that the religious interests of the Church would be greatly promoted by the change which this Bill proposes. We all know that people are induced easily to pass resolutions which cost them nothing; but the sincerity of these resolutions has been demonstrated by the enormous sums collected in order to endow the new bishoprics. I need not remind hon. Gentlemen that not a single shilling that is to go to the future incomes of these new Bishops is drawn from public funds. The funds are entirely of ecclesiastical origin and almost entirely of private origin. They have been subscribed, and subscribed *ad hoc.* And if this House were to reject, as I am confident when they know the facts they would never think of rejecting, the Second Reading of the Bill, I then ask what it would mean. It would mean that we had used our power to sterilise the great efforts and the unstinted benevolence which in the dioceses of Worcester and Rochester have come forward to endow the new bishoprics which the members of the Church of England in these two districts believe to be absolutely necessary for carrying on the work of the Church. May I say that the creation of these two new dioceses represents a movement which has nothing whatever to do with those unhappy ecclesiastical differences of which we have heard so much? It is not a High Church, a Broad Church, or a Low Church movement. High, Broad, and Low Church are all at one in those dioceses in desiring the creation of the new Bishops and in doing their best to see that this great reform of organisation should take place. Are we, therefore, who are not asked to spend a single sixpence of public money in this matter to come forward and take up the ungracious—to use a very mild word—position of saying that all this liberality and unstinted effort in a spiritual cause is to have no effect because for one reason or another we choose to put this grain of sand in the ecclesiastical machinery of the Church of England? That any churchman should do this I cannot believe.

I am quite aware that there is a section of zealous Churchmen who criticise quite honestly, though very severely, the action or inaction of the Bishops. Granted for the sake of argument that their charge against the Bishops, or against certain Bishops, is well founded; is the work of the episcopacy likely to be better done because you overwork them? If the Bishops have not supervised as they might have supervised the clergy over whom they preside, are they likely to be aided in the duty which hon. Members desire to throw upon them by having to deal with this overwhelming burden of daily labour which has broken down the health, I regret to say, of more than one Bishop in the past, and which, if unremedied, will break down the health of many Bishops in the future? This is visiting with something in the nature of physical torture men of whose conduct you may or may not have reason to complain, but which does nothing towards aiding the cause which the section of Churchmen of whom I speak have at heart. I should like to say another word to some of my hon. friends. They ardently desire the prosperity of the National Church as by law established, and they are ardent opponents of disestablishment. Can anything more further the cause of what I may call irrational disestablishment than to make it clear to everyone interested in the work of the Church that this House, for no reason whatever founded on the merits of the Bill brought before it, refuses to allow the Church the ordinary facilities which no one would dream of refusing in the case of any other organisation, whether connected with the State or not? I think those who oppose the Bill on grounds wholly outside the Bill, and claim to be, and genuinely are, ardent members of the Church of England, should think twice before they employ the Parliamentary machinery—as I have heard rumours that they intend to employ it—to obtain some indirect and remote effect by refusing to accede to the most reasonable, most moderate, requests, local in their character, involving no principle, which certain numbers of Churchmen of all shades of ecclesiastical opinion unanimously demanded in these dioceses.

I do not know whether that appeal will have any effect on my hon. friends. I hope it may; but I will appeal with at least equal confidence to hon. Gentlemen, whether on this side of the House or not, who are not members of the Church of England, who do not profess to like the system of Establishment, who do not approve either of episcopal organisations or of the doctrines of the English Church. They may differ from that Church; they may even be involved in vehement controversies which touch on political questions; and I do not feel that I have any title to complain of them if in open and fair contest they try to make out their case on a great public question where they feel that they differ from the Bishops, the clergy, and the great body of members of a communion to which they do not belong. That is fair and open warfare. I do not agree with their objects; I have no reason to complain, however, of their methods. But to use the power which their position as Members of this House may give them, not to touch any part of the work of the Church of England which by any extravagance of interpretation can be regarded as having a political reference, but merely to impair its utility as a great spiritual organisation—that I believe they will not condescend to do. I hope and think better of them. With many of them I have been in active, sometimes vehement, though, I hope, never bitter, conflict over controversies in recent years; but at all events they advocated a cause with which I did not agree, and they fought it in this House by fair and open methods. I would appeal to them whether they, who in large measure represent religious organisations, who bear their great part in the religious life of the country, are pursuing their duty and acting in conformity with their conscience when they use their power in this Legislature to prevent the Church of England from carrying out by means of its own funds what they know, and what every one else who has taken the smallest trouble to understand the case knows, must add greatly to her efficiency in those purely spiritual functions which even those who differ from her must desire to succeed. I beg to move.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

*MR. CHARLES McARTHUR (Liverpool, Exchange) said that in moving the Amendment which stood in his name he must first express his regret at finding himself in the uncongenial position of opposing the Government of the day. It was a position which certainly afforded him no satisfaction, on the contrary, it caused him much pain. But the situation was not a novel one, because during the six or seven years he had been a Member of the House while it had been his duty and privilege to give a general support to the policy of the Government, he had found himself unable to support them in their policy in respect of the Church. There were other Members on that side of the House who were in the same position, and they could not help feeling that the Government failed to appreciate the gravity of the position in which the Church now stood, and the necessity—to use the words of the Archbishop of Canterbury—for stern and drastic action in order that the law might be obeyed and the Protestantism of the country preserved. He would remind the House that as far back as 1877 the late Archbishop Tait referred to the Ritualistic movement as a conspiracy in their own body against the doctrine, discipline, and practices of the Established Church. What at that time was a conspiracy had now become an insurrection falling not far short of a revolution. He candidly admitted that in ordinary circumstances he would not have opposed this Bill, to the provisions of which, as far as he could see, no objection could be taken. On the contrary, it was desirable that each of these large dioceses should be subdivided in order that the clergy and laity might have the benefit of episcopal supervision. But what was safe and admissible in time of peace was unsafe and undesirable in time of strife. If part of the Army were disloyal to the Throne and Constitution, and desired to bring back into their country another dynasty, he presumed Parliament would hesitate to sanction the raising of new regiments or the appointment of new officers without receiving guarantees of fidelity. That was the position of the Church to-day. A large section of the Church to-day was disloyal to the law and to the Constitution, and, having regard to the condition of the dioceses out of which it was proposed to form the new dioceses of Southwark and Birmingham, he submitted that a new diocese meant a new centre of disaffection, and a new Bishop meant a new instrument to perpetuate or aggravate the existing state of affairs. He thought some guarantees ought to be required that the new dioceses would be administered in accordance with the law.

It was not entirely a question of money. He had been told that the promoters of the Bill had collected a certain sum of money and had a right to spend it as they liked, but in this case something more was asked for. This Bill asked for certain ecclesiastical and legal powers to be created, and before any such request was granted, he thought the interests of the Church as a whole must be considered. The evidence showed that widespread disorders prevailed in the Church at large, and especially in those dioceses to which this Bill related, and that the Archbishops and Bishops had failed to restrain those disorders. A great and fundamental change had come over the Church of England, and the spirit which pervaded the whole had shifted from Protestantism to something very like Roman Catholicism. He was sorry that the Return for which he asked the other day showing the extent to which irregularities prevailed in the parishes throughout the country had been refused He was told that the Royal Commission which had been appointed to inquire into this subject would get the evidence that it required, but if the Commission were to call witnesses from every parish in which irregularities of this kind existed they would have an arduous task. Taking the last Returns available, there were in England and Wales 2,000 clergy who wore mass vestments, which had been distinctly declared to be illegal; 265 churches in which incense was used, which also had been declared illegal by the Courts and condemned by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York sitting at Lambeth. These and other irregular practices, such as a celebration of Holy Communion without communicants, the elevation of the wafer, masses for the faithful departed, and services styled "the children's Eucharist" had been on the increase year by year during the last twenty years. The evil was often minimised. The Bishop of London the other day said the Royal Commission would break the greatest bubble of modern times, and that there were only a few churches in his diocese which required careful watching. Yet that Bishop's diocese was one of the worst in England in respect of these practices. In the diocese of Rochester there were 130 clerical members of the English Church Union, sixty-seven clerical members of the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament, nine clerical members of the Holy Cross Society, fourteen days using incense, and sixty-one who used mass vestments; so that the diocese was permeated by ritualistic practices.

One of the most unhappy features of the case was the effort which had been made to pervert the minds of the young through the medium of church services, and, he regretted to say also, through some of the day schools. One means used to that end was what was called "the children's Eucharist." In that case the children were compelled to take part in a distinctly illegal service. That service included vestments, lighted candles, genuflexions, and ceremonial incense, and was distinctly illegal. In the matter of his appointments the Bishop of Rochester was no exception to the other Bishops. He had appointed a great many clergymen who were known to be connected with ritualistic societies. The church of St. Saviour's, Southwark, which was to be the Cathedral of the new diocese, had a Chapter and four canons. Of these two were, he ventured to say, ritualists. One, the canon missioner of the diocese, was a member of the Church Union and of the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament, and was for ten years a member of the Holy Cross Society. The other, who had held the position of chaplain to the Bishop and had been made Archdeacon of Southwark in the last few weeks, had recently published a manual intended for the use of children at a children's Eucharist. In this he gave directions for a form of service which was essentially different in spirit from a Church of England service. It was distinctly intended to inculcate in the minds of children sacerdotal views.

He ventured to say that the law was not obeyed in the Cathedral itself, for he was informed that the Communion was celebrated with only one communicant, which was distinctly contrary to the law of the Church. He was surprised at the apathy which prevailed on this subject. He could not see why lay people should be punished when they broke the law, while the clergy broke the law with impunity. They appeared to be getting so hardened to these illegalities that they were beginning to look upon them as right and proper. Before sanctioning this Bill the House ought to be satisfied that the law was going to be obeyed in the diocese of Southwark. With regard to the diocese of Worcester, he thought the Protestant section of the Church was scandalised when a member of the English Church Union was appointed Bishop. A good many of the services in that diocese were distinctly illegal. Illegalities, too, were committed in the diocese of Canterbury. They all had a great respect for the Archbishop of Canterbury, but at the same time they knew that he had done nothing so far to fulfil the promise he made, that he would take action to enforce obedience to the law. The Archbishops and Bishops by the exercise of their veto failed altogether to restrain illegality.

SIR LEES KNOWLES (Salford, W.): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, is this point relevant to the question?

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is saying is that the ecclesiastical veto of the Bishops is not properly used by them, and, in those circumstances, I understand that he argues that the fewer Bishops there are the better.

SIR LEES KNOWLES: I understand that the hon. Member was about to argue that the Bishops and Archbishops do not use their power to suppress ritualistic practices.

*MR. SPEAKER: That point, I confess, seems to me to be rather more relevant than some of the matters the hon. Member has already referred to.

MR. CHARLES MCARTHUR, continuing, pointed out that the Bishops had used their veto against prosecutions, and played off one act against another. A Parliamentary Return showed that from 1874 to 1898 there were twenty-three complaints made to the Bishops, of which seventeen were vetoed. A further Return showed that from 1898 to 1902 there were no complaints. That was, of course, because people found it was useless to make complaints as they were invariably vetoed. Having regard to the state of the Church at the present time, and also to the state of these particular dioceses, he submitted that it was undesirable to proceed with the Bill. It would only aggravate the existing evils, by which a grievous wrong was inflicted upon the nation. Moreover, to pass the Bill would be an indication that the House were indifferent on the subject; whereas the Protestant laity were deeply concerned about the present position. At the present time he could not help feeling that there were two great currents moving the nation, one tending to sacerdotalism, and the other to infidelity. The masses of the Protestant laity were alarmed about the present position and looked to the Bishops for redress. The Bishops having failed to give them redress they now came to the House of Commons to find a remedy for their wrongs. Five years ago that subject was before the House, and the Government, in refusing to pass the Church Discipline Bill, promised that if the efforts of the Archbishops and Bishops were not speedily effective further legislation would be passed. The evil had gone on increasing, and now instead of giving them legislation the Government gave an inquiry which might last for an indefinite number of years. The disloyal clergy were continuing to indoctrinate the masses of the people with doctrines which were not those of the Church of England, and until the Royal Commission had reported as to the condition of the Church he contended that no further progress should be made with that Bill. That would show that at all events there was a determination that the Bishops should do their duty, that the law should be obeyed, and the Protestant character of the country upheld. He begged to move the Amendment standing in his name.

Mr. BRYNMOR JONES (Swansea District) said he rose to second the Motion. The hon. Member who moved this Resolution had covered so much of the ground that he would be able to say all he desired to say in a very short space of time. What was the argument which the Prime Minister had urged? He said: "Here is a great spiritual organisation which under its constitution is bound, if it wants to alter the machinery for carrying on its work in the best way, to come to this House." It came to this House, and then the right hon. Gentleman said they would be opposing a spiritual organisation and hampering the work of the Church if they did not give all those facilities which the Church demanded from time to time. The Church of England, however, was not simply a spiritual organisation, but it was a political organisation, and when the right hon. Gentleman said to him, "You are going to hamper the work of a spiritual organisation," the first answer he would make to him was that that organisation might terminate its connection with the House of Commons if it liked and put itself in the same position as other religious denominations. He failed to see that there was any substantial force in the appeal which the right hon. Gentleman had made. He was not concerned to deny that it might be a very proper thing to divide those dioceses, and if he could help forward the division honestly and conscientiously he would do it. But what was his duty in the matter? He objected to the doctrines and to the ritual of the Church of England as developed during the last 100 years. The Bishops did not keep the clergy in order; dogmas were openly preached, false doctrines were taught and books were being circulated containing all sorts of old mediæval notions, and a ritual plainly against the directions of the Prayer-book was being used. Under such circumstances what was his duty as a politician and a Member of Parliament? It was their duty to see that the law was obeyed, and they ought not to give any facilities to a movement in the direction of Romanising the Church as established by law. He agreed that the House could not now decide whether a particular religious service was lawful or unlawful, but it was their duty to observe the great movement of opinion in the country. He asserted that the evidence showed not only that the principal offenders against the law persisted in their malpractices, but that the disorder was, under their defiant activity, one that was ever growing and threatened to spread more and more throughout the country, and he would show the House enough to justify the inference that they had to deal, not only with isolated and sporadic instances, but that there was a concerted movement to alter the fundamental principles of the Establishment.

He would not say anything about the history of what was known as the Oxford Movement. That was well known to most Members of the House; but he might say that whatever the original intention of the group of clergymen who began it, it had in its later development become an obvious attempt to assimilate the doctrine and usage of the English Church to that of the Roman Church. As far back as 1877, Archbishop Tait said in Convocation, in calling attention to a little confessional book for children issued, as it turned out, by the Society of the Holy Cross—

> "I have now given your Lordships all the information that I have on this subject. I do it with the greatest pain. I do it with a full appreciation of the goodness of the men with whom we have to deal; but no admiration of any points in their character ought, I think, to make us hesitate as to whatever may appear to be our duty in the endeavour to counteract what I feel obliged to call a conspiracy within our own body against the doctrine, the discipline, and the practice of the Reformed Church."

That was said by the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1877. Over twenty-five years had passed, and instead of those disorders having abated they had increased. The Bishop of Hereford, writing recently, said—

> "The section of the clergy which has come under the influence of this stream of tendency has been very earnest in propaganda and socially prominent, and it has for a considerable period been left to work steadily, and in many points of vantage, to wipe out the Protestant character of the Church of England, and to revive under the vague, and consequently misleading, name of Catholic, the Church of the darker ages, with its rule of sacerdotal authority over the individual conscience, its encouragement of the confessional, its doctrine of the Mass, its baseless dogmas about the state of the dead, and its imposing symbolic and spectacular worship. All this is fascinating to weak and emotional natures, and to a luxurious and sensation-loving society; but to any thoughtful person who understands what English life owes to the Reformation, it is clear that hardly any greater misfortune could befall our Church and nation than the success of such an endeavour."

It was to prevent the success of that endeavour that he seconded this Motion. He had intended to go a little into the way in which what he called false doctrines were being permitted under the auspices of the Established Church, but he hardly thought it was necessary now to do that. He had read a good deal of the literature connected with the Oxford Movement, and he admired the scholarly and graceful style of many of the books, but in substance he found them very stale, flat, and unprofitable reading. The inference he drew from that literature was that for the most part it was given up to trying to prove propositions which were inconsistent with the Protestant faith. He noticed that in recent controversies many people had been questioning the use of the word "Protestant" and the assumption of the word "Catholic" by the Church of England. He had been considering what authority he could appeal to in order to secure something like a reasonable definition or analysis of the word "Protestant," and he had consulted Sir George Cornewall Lewis's book on "The Influence of Authority in Matters of Opinion," in which he examines the claims of the Church of Rome and the claims and theories of the Protestant Churches. After describing the attitude of the Church of Rome, Sir George Cornewall Lewis says—

> "On the other hand, the Protestant Churches hold that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament contain everything which goes to make up Christianity, and that they are the exclusive and ultimate rule of faith. They deny the existence of any uninterrupted and exclusive transmission of true doctrine in any Church since the times of the Apostles."

If that was the test of Protestantism, then nearly all the manuals circulated and many of the sermons being preached were against the fundamental principles of the Protestant religion. The hon. Gentleman opposite said he would leave him to deal with some of the facts about the bishopric of Worcester. He had only one case to cite in connection with that bishopric, but there were undoubtedly many of a similar character. The case to which he should like to call the Prime Minister's attention was that of St. Jude's, Birmingham. It was the case of Mr. Pinchard, whom the Prime Minister appointed on the understanding that he was not a ritualist.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No. Well, I cannot remember exactly what I did in Mr. Pinchard's case; but certainly in every case subsequent to that—the dates are not exactly in my mind—I had to be very careful in advising the Crown in such a fashion as always to see that there should be a promise of obedience to the Bishop. Mr. Pinchard not only differs from the hon. Gentleman, and most of us, in his views of what ritual should be, but he has also the misfortune to differ from His Majesty's Government on every known question of politics; that might soften the hon. Gentleman's opposition.

MR. BRYNMOR JONES: The right hon. Gentleman said last year, when Mr. Pinchard was appointed, that he was sure he was not a ritualist.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am not sure whether I got a promise from him.

MR. BRYNMOR JONES said the answer of the right hon. Gentleman was in the report of *The Parliamentary Debates.* With regard to the controversy that was going on, he put it to the House whether the kind of proceedings he was going to cite were fair. The statement he would read described a service which took place on the 24th January this year, at St. Jude's, Birmingham.

It was called a children's Eucharist—

"A large number of children were present and some adults, the majority of whom were evidently teachers. There were twelve candles alight on or above the altar. The children were supplied with a service-book called 'The Children's Eucharist, St. Jude's.' A copy was lent to me (the reporter); it contained neither printer's nor publisher's name, and it was marked 'Not to be taken away.' It consisted of an outline of the Prayer-book service of Holy Communion interspersed with other prayers and hymns. Before the Prayer of Consecration are printed in italic capitals the words 'Now Jesus comes, be very still.' After the Prayer of Consecration are printed in italics: 'Our Lord Jesus Christ is now verily and indeed present, keep very still and say this prayer very solemnly.' The following prayer occurs in the book, and is, I believe, the one indicated: 'O Jesus! because thou hast said it, we believe that the bread is now Thy body—we believe that the wine is now Thy blood. O Jesus Christ, our God, we adore Thee.'"

That was the service from the children's point of view. The celebrant on the day mentioned wore mass vestments, and performed a ceremony which, while it appeared to comply with the directions of the Book of Common Prayer introduced practices already condemned by the Courts of law in this country and many of which appeared to him to be of very doubtful legality. He was glad the right hon. Gentleman had appointed a Commission; that was an admission that there were a great many irregularities, and until the Commission had reported he hoped that the present Bill would be delayed.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out from the word 'That' to the end of the Question, in order to add the words 'in view of the continuance in the Established Church of England and Wales of grave and widespread disorders which the Archbishops and Bishops have failed to restrain, this House declines to assent to any revival of the provisions of The Bishoprics Act, 1878, until satisfactory assurances are obtained that the Archbishops and Bishops will enforce a reasonable conformity by the clergy to the Book of Common Prayer, the Articles of Religion, and the law as determined by the Courts which have statutory jurisdiction in matters ecclesiastical,'—(*Mr. Charles McArthur.*)—instead thereof."

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN (Birmingham, W.).: I venture to ask the House to allow me to speak in a few words as the senior representative of one of the districts affected by this Bill. I speak solely as such a representative. The House is aware that I am myself a Nonconformist, and as such I should not have thought it desirable, or even proper, that I should intervene in questions concerning the Church of England. I am not only a Nonconformist, but I am myself, and always have been, in favour of the policy of disestablishment. I have thought and said that the adoption of that policy would really be a relief to the Church of England, that it would increase its spiritual influence, and that it would save it from attacks which are now made upon it on the grounds of its holding an exceptional and privileged position. I am not going to follow the hon. Members who have spoken in a theological discussion; I hardly think this House is the place for such details as those to which we have listened. But, speaking generally, I may say that I am strongly opposed to the illegal practices to which they have referred. Putting aside any question of theological doctrine, I am opposed to them because they are illegal. To my mind it matters not in the least whether a man is a layman or a priest, he is bound to obey the law; and if, as hon. Members have asserted, and as I suppose is the case, at all events exceptionally—if, as they assert, the law is broken, by all means do everything you can to see that the law is observed. But proceed against the law-breakers; do not attempt to proceed in this extremely indirect way by punishing the wrong people. Why are a number of worthy Church people in Birmingham, the majority of whom happen to belong not to the section of the Church which is guilty of these illegal practices, but to the other section of the Church, why are they to be prevented from completing their spiritual organisation because in some other place and some other district, or even in exceptional instances in their own district, the law is being broken? Let those who contend that the law is broken proceed against the law breakers. But it is said that there are great difficulties in the way, that it is very expensive, that is the first thing. Very well, if that be the case, try to alter the law so as to make the prosecution of this illegality more easy. That is clearly the duty of those who, like my hon. friend and the hon. Gentleman opposite, desire to see the speedy redress of this grievance. I agree most heartily with them. If the law is broken that ought to be stopped; and if the present means of stopping it are insufficient I should be glad to support them when they bring forward a measure, which commended itself to me on other grounds, which would secure the due observance of the law.

It is said that another reason why the law cannot at present be made operative is because of the Bishops' veto. Well, again, that is the law, and as long as that is the law you have to accept it. If you do not like the law, and think this veto should be taken from the Bishops, then I say you are justified in bringing in a Bill to alter it. But the law must be altered first. For all these reasons I think that my hon. friend and the hon. Gentleman opposite are proceeding on wrong lines; and while I sympathise to a large extent with their object, I object altogether to the methods —pardon me if I use the word, I do so in no offensive sense—the unworthy methods by which they seek to attain those ends. I cannot quite follow my hon. friend the Member for Liverpool in what he has said as to Birmingham. Although we have got a good number of Welshmen and a few Liverpool men in Birmingham I cannot help thinking that the city will prefer to be represented by its own men, and not by a Member for a division of Wales or a Member for Liverpool. What does my hon. friend say about Birmingham? He said, I understood, that it was one of the dioceses that was particularly affected by this illegality. Well, that is entirely contrary to the fact.

MR. CHARLES McARTHUR was understood to say that Birmingham was not so largely affected.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Quite so; my hon. friend began by saying that both dioceses were affected by this pernicious evil, and Rochester more than Birmingham. Birmingham, so far as the Church organisation is concerned, is essentially and substantially Evangelical. That is owing to the fact that there are a great number of Evangelical trusts, such as the Simeon Trusts, by whom the larger portion of the clerical appointments are made; and consequently, although ritualism is represented in Birmingham, that side of Church opinion is, I should say, represented only to a very slight extent. Then my hon. friend made a remark which I very much regretted and to which I must give a respectful contradiction. He said the Church in Birmingham were scandalised by the appointment of the present Bishop of Worcester. I am thankful to say, having the reputation of Birmingham at heart, that there was no such opinion expressed or felt by the vast majority of the people. The Bishop of Worcester, of course, came amongst us practically as a stranger; few, I suppose, had ever seen him or met him; but there was every desire to receive him as became his position and his character, and to give him every assistance in the duties he had to perform. Now that we do know the Bishop of Worcester, who has been amongst us a considerable time, we know that he has won golden opinions from everybody, from Nonconformists quite as much as from Churchmen, and his moderate, generous, broad, and religious influence is exercising the best effect upon the people of the city. I do not think the city of Birmingham need be picked out as specially affected by these practices, or need be specially penalised because these practices exist in other parts of the kingdom.

My hon. friend the Member for Liverpool endeavoured to draw a comparison between the state of things in the Church and a supposititious existence of disloyalty in the Army. It seems to me the illustration is entirely irrelevant, but I will give him an illustration which seems to me to exemplify what he proposed. Supposing the people of Liverpool were asking for the appointment of a second County Court Judge, and that the appointment had to be made from this House, if I were to come down from Birmingham and say there was a County Court Judge in Birmingham who had given decisions of which I disapproved, and that therefore we objected to any increase of judicial assistance in Liverpool, that would be an illustration. It appears to me the cases are exactly on all fours; and I do beg the House, on behalf of Birmingham, to consider what I assure them is the almost universal opinion, without respect to religious differences, of the people of Birmingham, that it would be most desirable in the interests, not merely of religious organisations, but of all the charitable organisations which are so largely dealt with by the Church—that it is in the interests of these great influences that the organisation of the Church in Birmingham should be completed. I hope the House will not stand in the way of the philanthropic efforts of the Churchpeople of Birmingham who, out of their own pocket, have found all that is requisite in order to endow the new bishopric and will not make their sacrifices vain, for what? Not because any objection whatever has been taken or can be taken, on the merits, against this proposal, but because there is somewhere or other in the Church subjects of complaint which can be dealt with by totally different means.

MR. NEWDIGATE (Warwickshire, Nuneaton) said that as one living in the diocese of Worcester he wished to thank the Prime Minister very much for having introduced this Bill. He should also like to thank the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham for having supported the Bill in the way he had done. As one living in the diocese he knew what the feeling of the people in that part of Warwickshire was, and he could say that one and all were in favour of this Bill. He thought it was extremely hard that because a few ultra-anti-High Churchpeople were against the Bill, they should try to postpone its passage. They, in the diocese, had put their hands in their pockets and subscribed the sum of £103,000, in about a year, of the £105,000 which was the sum that was wanted. In reference to this, he might say that the Bishop of Worcester—who he was sorry to hear spoken of in a way that no person in the Church or diocese of Worcester would approve of—had given the greater part of his fortune in order to help this bishopric forward. He ventured to say that when the man at the head of the diocese acted in that way, they would be very churlish indeed not to support him in the best way they could. He had in his hand a list of the subscriptions towards the bishopric fund, ranging from very large sums given by wealthy people to the humble £1 given by poor artisans. One Sunday was set apart in the diocese for collecting money for the bishopric fund, and in the mining and manufacturing districts almost every church did very well indeed on that particular Sunday. One church in his own neighbourhood, the congregation of which was composed almost entirely of miners, subscribed something like £11. He knew, from his own experiences, that at the present time it was almost impossible for one man to work the bishopric of Worcester. It contained the enormous population of 1,400,000 people; there were 781 benefices in it, and it embraced the towns of Coventry, Kidderminster, Leamington, and Warwick, besides Birmingham, which alone had a population of something like 538,000. He wanted to ask his hon. friend who sat below him, and who talked as if he alone and those who sympathised with him had the right to call themselves the representatives of the Evangelical party in the Church of England—whether he and his friends had ever visited the diocese of Worcester and whether they had ever consulted the opinion of the Evangelical supporters of the Church there with reference to this Bill? If they came down into the diocese he would take them to visit the various churches, and, with the exception of Mr. Pinchard's church in Birmingham, his hon. friend would see nothing whatever that he could possibly complain of. He asked the House to support the Prime Minister on this occasion and to vote against the Amendment.

*MR. AUSTIN TAYLOR (Liverpool, East Toxteth) said the Amendment had this advantage as against the alternative course alluded to by the right hon. Member for West Birmingham, that it did not seek in any way to alter the ritual or the discipline of the Church of England, and therefore it could not be urged against the Amendment that the State was seeking to impose its authority upon the Church. He did not know whether the right hon. Gentleman was familiar with the course of events in that House as regards Church matters during recent years. The right hon. Gentleman had had much to occupy him in other directions, and the persistent efforts which had been made to bring the grave state of affairs in the Church before that House and to obtain legislation in pursuance of the explicit pledges of the Government might have escaped his notice. In dealing with this Bill they must recognise that they were dealing with an Established Church, not with a purely voluntary society but with a spiritual organisation—not a political organisation, as his hon. friend seemed to think, but a spiritual organisation which, through its connection with the State, had undertaken certain statutory obligations; and it was because there had been breaches of those obligations on the part of the clergy, not sporadically here or there, but breaches so serious that the Government after five years of reflection had decided to appoint a Royal Commission to inquire into those alleged illegalities, that his hon. friend was justified in raising this question by his Amendment. The Church of England in relation to the State was an interesting subject of investigation; but it would be altogether too wide, in speaking to the Amendment, were he to enter into the relations between Church and State in this country. He must say, however, that occasionally when he considered the thorny, controversial, and almost hopeless character of the problems with which they were confronted; when he thought of the clergy and their practices in the National Church, there were moments when he thought with his right hon. friend the Member for West Birmingham, that the situation would be more easily dealt with if the Church were a purely voluntary society. These, however, were rare moments, and when he came back as a Member of this House, and as a citizen, to the facts of the case, he felt that it was essential to maintain the connection between Church and State for the good of religion, and for the benefit of the Constitution of the country.

What was the position before the House? The Bill requested from this House facilities for ecclesiastical machinery. He did not think it went further than that; that in asking for these bishoprics they were asking for nothing which would materially assist the lot of the clergy, either in Birmingham or Southwark. If the Bill asked for anything which would materially improve the lot of the parochial clergy, if it were intended to relieve some of the struggling and poorly-paid clergy, he would hesitate to oppose it. The proposal, however, was merely one for providing additional ecclesiastical machinery, and it was fair to ask that before this was given they should have guarantees from those who represented the Church in this country that the original obligation as settled by the Act of Uniformity should be carried out. He agreed with the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham that illustrations given in the course of debate were generally misleading. The right hon. Gentleman spoke of an almost inconceivable instance of misbehaviour in Birmingham on the part of a County Court Judge, and implied that it would be unreasonable to refer to such misbehaviour as a reason for not appointing a Judge in Liverpool. Had a Royal Commission been appointed to inquire into supposed judicial irregularities throughout the country he submitted that Members would be entitled to raise the question in that House. The question raised last year concerning the patronage of Keble College, Oxford, had, he supposed, nothing to do with the dioceses of Southwark and Birmingham, but he desired to refer to it because the question he wished to raise was whether the Church as a whole was carrying out her obligations, and whether those exercising the functions of the hierarchy were doing so in accordance with the law. That might not have anything to do with the dioceses of Birmingham and Southwark; but what he was entitled to raise, as between the Church and the State, and what he desired to raise, was whether the Church as a whole was carrying out her obligations and whether those who were exercising the functions of the hierarchy in the Church were doing so in accordance with the laws of this realm. In view of the way in which the patronage of Keble College, Oxford, had been exercised——

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! I fail to see what the methods by which Keble College exercises its patronage have to do with this Bill.

*MR. AUSTIN TAYLOR said he was going to point out that two Bishops, the Bishops of Lincoln and of Rochester, were members of the council of the College.

MR. SPEAKER: That is very remote.

MR. AUSTIN TAYLOR said he would not pursue the point further and would submit to the ruling of the Chair. He, however, felt very strongly on the matter. Of course, opinions would differ in this House, and out of it, as to the extent of the evils of which they complained; but this must be admitted, that those evils had gone so far that His Majesty's Government five years ago admitted a contingent need for legislation, and had now appointed a Royal Commission to inquire whether legislation was really necessary. He thought it was a most reasonable contention of his hon. friend and colleague that any additional ecclesiastical machinery might very well wait until that Royal Commission had reported. He quite admitted that in taking up a position of this kind he might be charged with unduly severe treatment of the Church as a whole; but they had to deal with circumstances as they found them, and seeing that the inquiry would shortly proceed—he did not know to what length, but he hoped it would not be too long drawn-out—he thought those facilities might very well wait until the Royal Commission had reported, and possibly the fact that those facilities were waiting might lead to an earlier Report of the Commission than they might otherwise hope for. He felt that as opportunities in this House of raising a question of this kind as between the Church and the State were so rare, and that as the House of Commons, was, after all, the only representative Assembly they had got, imperfect instrument though it was for the laity of the Church of England, those interested in the Church and in its Protestant aspect were justified in raising these questions as opportunity offered.

It might be, as his right hon. friend the Prime Minister said, that in raising those questions they were adopting an unduly harsh attitude towards a portion, or, if hon. Members liked, the whole of a great spiritual organisation to which they were deeply attached. He quite admitted the force of the contention of his right hon. friend. It was not an agreeable position for those who desired to maintain the Protestant character of the Church of England to find themselves obliged to come forward on an occasion like the present and assume an attitude which possibly ordinary Members of the House who did not feel so keenly, although they were quite as much attached to the Evangelical side of the Church, might not approve. It was a disagreeable matter to have to do it. But on whom did the responsibility rest? Surely, the responsibility rested primarily on those in the Church, who having authority did not exercise it to put down those practices. Perhaps even beyond them, the responsibility rested on those clergy, against whose private character and conscientious convictions he had nothing to say, but who determinedly persisted in a course of action which could only land the Church in irretrievable disaster. Surely, also, the responsibility in the last degree rested with the Government. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham said he was in favour of disciplinary legislation; that if the law was not what it ought to be, let them make it what it ought to be;

and that if a measure of that kind were brought forward he would support it, although he was careful to add that in his private opinion, which he had always held, disestablishment would be a preferable or at any rate a more equitable solution of the difficulty. Surely in view of the fact of those admitted difficulties, and that five years had passed since this House solemnly pledged itself to deal with this matter and also with the question of the distribution of the patronage of the Crown, the responsibility rested on the Government, who, although they were indebted to private Members, including himself, for continually bringing this matter to their recollection, had yet shown considerable hesitation and delay in grappling with a subject which ultimately they or their successors would be bound to grapple with. He had presumed too long on the time of the House, but this was a matter on which he felt keenly. He recognised that the House had a certain responsibility; but he felt that if, as time went on, nothing were done that responsibility would grow greater and not less. It was because he did not wish events to take a direction less favourable to the Church, which they might if those evils were not grappled with, that he was prepared to take the extreme course of raising the issue on the Bill before the House.

*MR. LOWE (Birmingham, Edgbaston) said that, as representing a very large body of Churchpeople in Birmingham, he wished to give all the support in his power to the Second Reading of this Bill, and he desired to make a strong appeal to Members on both sides of the House not to place any obstacle in the way of its being passed into law. It was simply a measure designed and intended to ratify and give legal sanction to an arrangement which had already been provisionally entered into by all the Churchpeople resident in the localities with which it dealt, an arrangement which was unanimously approved of and supported by all who were interested in the matter; and the money for carrying out of which had been already subscribed by the people concerned. It had the warm approval of the present Bishop of the diocese, who could not have given a better proof of his approval and of his earnestness in the matter than he had given by giving £800 a year of his present income and nearly the whole of his private fortune in support of this scheme. It was admitted by everyone who was acquainted with the diocese of Worcester, as at present constituted, that it was far too large and unwieldy and too diverse in the nature of its population and interests to be properly supervised and administered by a single Bishop. He believed it consisted of about 500 parishes with an average population of something like 3,000 souls in each parish, and the difficulty was exaggerated and rendered greater by the fact that those parishes formed part of three archdeaconries which were quite different in their sympathies and interests. He did not quite know when the diocese of Worcester was first established, but it was quite certain that when it was established Birmingham was scarcely as large as Worcester now was. But now Birmingham had grown to such an extent that it contained a population larger than all the rest of the diocese put together; and—as everyone knew—it had become one of the chief cities and one of the first commercial centres in the whole of the United Kingdom. It had been described as the best governed city in the world; it had a Lord Mayor, a University, and all the other attributes and adjuncts of a great city, except a Bishop and a Cathedral; and why it should be considered less worthy than Liverpool, Manchester, Newcastle, or Bristol to have a Bishop of its own, he was entirely at a loss to understand.

Those best acquainted with the spiritual needs of the locality, and those who were best competent to judge of this matter, were strongly of opinion that Birmingham stood very much in need of an independent diocesan organisation, centred in a Bishop, whose seat should be, not in Worcester, but in Birmingham itself; and they believed that the moral, spiritual and social welfare of all those who lived in the great industrial district of which Birmingham was the centre would be greatly promoted if this see were established. He could not at all understand how anyone who wished to see the work of the Church of England prosper and progress, how anyone who wished to see the spiritual life of the people fostered and encouraged, could object to this Bill. Much less could he understand why those who believed in the virtue of local self-government should object to the Churchpeople of Birmingham and its district being allowed, at all events, in an administrative matter of this kind, to manage their own affairs in the manner which seemed to them best. It appeared to him that his hon. friends representing Divisions of Liverpool and the hon. Gentlemen opposite who so strongly condemned illegal and irregular practices in the Church of England should be among the first and the most prominent in support of this Bill, for it stood to reason that the smaller and more compact a diocese was the better would the Bishop in charge of it be able to regulate and control its proceedings and to put down any evil practices which were found to exist. And just the same thing applied to hon. Gentlemen who objected to anything in the administrative action of the present holder of the see, for that was clearly a reason why they should support this Bill, because it was quite obvious that the Bishop would have a much smaller diocese to look after when the Bill was passed than he had at present and therefore would be able to look after it better. On all those grounds he heartily supported the Bill.

*MR. EMMOTT (Oldham) said he wished to do every justice in his power to those who opposed the Bill, but he could not see that they had made out any case at all. He had listened very carefully to what they had said, because he had a great deal of fundamental sympathy with the views they held. He would suggest to them whether it was not possible that the establishment of these new bishoprics might not tend to benefit the cause they had at heart. Bishops, if they did not prosecute, did advise and admonish, and if they had more Bishops they might get more advice and admonishment, whereas if they had overworked Bishops they might get less advice and admonishment. The present Bishop of Manchester had been transferred from Birmingham to Manchester. A clergyman remarked to him that the new Bishop of Manchester was a very Low Churchman. He did not know if this were the case or not; but he wished to point out that if he had remained at Birmingham and Birmingham had been made a bishopric, the precise effect which Members who opposed the Bill desired would have occurred, and that instead of the Bishop of Worcester, to whom they objected, they would have had a Bishop whose views were mainly in accordance with their own. As to the Bishop of Worcester, he should like to say that he did not think there was in the Church of England or in any religious body in the country a more noble and more saintly figure. He (Mr. Emmott) did not deny there were serious irregularities in the Church of England, but what he deplored more than these irregularities was the spirit of ecclesiasticism which was spreading in the Church, the magnifying of Church authority as against the authority of the individual conscience and the tendency to materialism both among the religious and the irreligious. The excess of ritual, of which so much was said, was not half so important as the spirit which underlay it. He would ask this practical question—were they going to stop that movement by prosecuting people for ritualistic practices or by opposing a change of machinery in the Church itself? He ventured to think that the opposition which was raised to this Bill did give some colour to the feeling that opponents of ritualism in the Church of England did take a narrow and somewhat bitter view, and put forward, in a manner which was by no means wise, views which they strongly held and which to a large extent he completely sympathised with. He was certain that by opposing a Bill like this, not on its merits, they were doing damage to the cause they professed. As to the wider question of the connection between the Church and the State, although a Churchman, he was in favour of disestablishment. The more he saw of that House the more he saw how utterly unfitted it was to deal with questions connected with the Church. The question of disestablishment however was not a practical question now, and until that question came before them in a practical form they had no right to oppose a Bill like this, which was merely one for a necessary change of machinery. Therefore he must support the Second Reading of the Bill.

MR. KIMBER (Wandsworth) said that, as the representative of the largest constituency in the Metropolis and one of the 2,000,000 people in South London hoped that this Bill would bring to them a great amelioration of the present ecclesiastical conditions of South London, the House would no doubt bear with him while he expressed the views which he believed to be those of the large majority of the people he represented. The Bill asked the House for nothing in the way of money or power, but merely to give them facilities to improve their own internal administration. It dealt in no way with doctrine, ritual, or with discipline in the Church. It left those matters untouched, and he would have thought, subject to the greater knowledge of Mr. Speaker, that the Amendment would have been almost out of order, for this Bill did not touch any of the grounds upon which the mover and seconder sought to deprive him and those for whom he spoke of the benefits of this Bill. The seconder of the Amendment had based his opposition to the Bill on the ground that he objected to the doctrine and ritual of the Church of England as developed in the last seventy-five years. There was not a word in the Bill from first to last about making changes in the doctrine of the Church. The hon. Gentleman also objected to the false doctrines which were taught under the Established Church. The House would want to know, first of all, whether the hon. Member referred to the doctrines within the law of the Church or to those outside. This Bill did not deal with them, whether they were within the law of the Church or not. He claimed that this was a people's Bill and not an ecclesiastical Bill. A fund of £50,000 had already been raised among the people of South London, and as soon as this Bill passed, as it must pass, the fund would be raised to over £100,000 to endow the bishopric. He, therefore, appealed to hon. Members representing Swansea and Liverpool constituencies to leave the South Londoners to manage their own affairs. There should be liberty for all, within bounds, in the Church of England, both for High and Low Churchmen. He himself had no objection to High Churchmen simply because they were High Churchmen, nor was he aware that they had any objection to him because he was what was called a Low Churchman. The Bishop of Rochester was a High Churchman, but he came among the people of South London and they were able to judge what his principles and practices were, and he could say without fear of contradiction that a large majority of the 2,000,000 people for whom he spoke would testify to the worthiness and the legality, from the Church point of view, of those practices. What the Amendment said was that admitting the Bill to be a good Bill seeking to improve the administration of their own affairs, unless they did something against somebody else in some other part of London they should not be allowed to improve their position. He entreated hon. Members to withhold any opposition, whatever their predilections might be with regard to other parts of the country, and allow this relief to be given.

MR. GRIFFITH BOSCAWEN (Kent, Tunbridge) appealed to the mover and seconder of the Amendment to be content with having raised the question, and not to press their Motion to a division. He did not complain of their raising the question, as persons who felt strongly on any matter were entitled to take every opportunity of ventilating their grievances. For his own part, he joined with his hon. friends to the extent of regretting the existence of certain abuses, and believing that means would certainly have to be taken to compel obedience to the law of the Church of England. But was the course they were now taking likely to lead to the accomplishment of their desire? Granted that certain abuses existed and that sufficient measures had not been taken to remove them, would that condition of affairs be altered by stopping this Bill, which merely effected an administrative reform, and preventing large masses of the people from obtaining proper ecclesiastical supervision? The Bill had been objected to on the ground that it would add to the number of Bishops, and that the Bishops had not done their duty in the ritualistic controversy. He did not think hon. Members were sufficiently aware of what the Bishops had done. They had had to deal with an exceedingly difficult situation, to curb practices, the illegality of which was often doubtful, and to interfere in the case of men who were doing splendid work in the cause of religion. It was their duty not to damp down religious ardour, or to press things too far merely to obtain legal compliance; and in many cases where no public action had been taken, the Bishops had done much quietly and privately to put a stop to certain practices. The best way to secure greater conformity to the law was to strengthen the administrative control of the Bishops, and that could be done only by ensuring that the areas over which they had control were such that they could promptly and effectively exercise their powers.

The people of Birmingham, including non-members of the Church of England, unanimously desired that that city should be made an ecclesiastical centre, having its own Bishop, and, when they had themselves supplied the funds and made all necessary provision, he could not conceive on what grounds Parliament could refuse its assent. In regard to Rochester, he could speak from personal experience. South London was probably the greatest unbroken area of poverty in the world; and in no place was there greater need for genuine spiritual work. That work was being splendidly done by the Church of England, but it was seriously hampered from the administrative point of view by the non-existence or a separate see. The diocese of Rochester, which included South London, parts of Surrey, and a portion of Kent, was all placed under the ecclesiastical care of a Bishop whose first interest must be in South London That was a most anomalous position, and was not at all for the benefit of the Church or of the people. South London, in the diocese of Rochester, had a population of 1,750,000, and it increased at the rate of 30,000 per annum. Surely that was an area complete in itself and entitled to its own diocese. The rejection of this Bill would do nothing towards correcting the abuses of which complaint was made, but it would tend to render less efficient the Church of England. All would acknowledge the splendid work of that body, especially among the poorer classes in the great cities. Was the administrative efficiency of that work to be hindered because particular views were held with regard to certain services in certain churches? That was an unreasonable attitude to take up, and he hoped hon. Members would not press the Amendment to a division.

COLONEL SANDYS (Lancashire, Bootle), in supporting the Amendment said that, while it might be very desirable that Bishops should be appointed for Birmingham and Southwark, the main objection to the Bill was that it treated the matter as a local question rather than as a broad question affecting the Church of England as a whole. The point upon which the House ought to concentrate its attention was whether or not the Bishops as a whole had adhered to their ordination vows. The view which he took of the position of a Bishop in the Church of England was the same as he would take of that of the chief of any other great Department, whether in Church or in State. It was firmly believed by many devoted members of the Church of England, who longed for nothing so much as her well-being in all respects, that her greatest enemy was the introduction of doctrines of the Church of Rome into her teaching and ritual. There were many churches in which members of the Church of England as established at the Reformation could not worship, as they were unable to distinguish the services from those of the Church of Rome. It was the business of the Bishops to curb those practices, but instead of taking measures to that end, they seemed to be unable or unwilling to deal with the matter. On an occasion like the present when the House and the country were asked to add to the number of Bishops, the members of the Protestant section of the Church of England considered it to be their duty to protest against the appointment of additional Bishops until those who were already appointed were in a position to control or master the position and exercise their duty in a proper way. What would be said of a person who held communion with the enemy and allowed practices to go on between his army and the army of the enemy and did not take steps to check it at all hazards? That was the position the Government had taken up, and on that account he thought it was his duty to appeal to the House of Commons to refuse consent to this Bill until such time as His Majesty's Government took the decided step which they promised to take five years ago, and until they saw that the Bishops themselves showed that they had some desire to grapple with and control this growing evil in the Church of England.

One particular thing for which he thought the Bishops were greatly to blame was that they had failed to grapple with the men who had set the law at defiance, who regarded not the decisions of the House of Commons, and who having undertaken to obey the Thirty-nine Articles were content to eat the bread of the Church and do the work of the Church's enemies. How did those men get into their present positions? They were admitted into the Church by the Bishops. Why did the Bishops not make it impossible for a man to pass into holy orders unless he gave some assurance that he would, under no circumstances, take part in what he must describe as traitorous actions. The Bishop's examining chaplain admitted these men to the Church, and the Bishop himself appointed his own examining chaplain, and if the Bishop admitted them he was to blame. The House of Commons was now being asked to increase the number of Bishops without any assurance being given that these practices would be discontinued, and consequently they appealed to the House of Commons on no account to consent to this Bill until some definite and satisfactory assurance had been given by the Bishops to the country that these ritualistic practices in the Church of England should be put an end to. He knew that the opponents of this Bill were in a minority, but if he went into the lobby alone he should vote against this measure, because he considered it ought not to be passed. He apologised for having spoken with some warmth, but this was a question upon which he felt very deeply.

MR. SEELY (Lincoln) said he agreed very thoroughly with many of the opinions of those who had moved the Amendment, but as a Member who had some knowledge of a portion of the proposed Southwark bishopric he joined with the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham in urging the supporters of this Amendment to withdraw their opposition to this Bill. No one who at all realised the work which had been done by the Bishops and who had any knowledge of the circumstances of the two dioceses, could doubt the desirability of the measure submitted to the House to-day. In both cases the populations were very large. The case of Birmingham had been spoken of by many hon. Members, but he desired to say a few words about the Southwark district. Everyone who had any knowledge of London knew not only how large the population in the Southwark diocese was now, but also how constantly it was increasing, and what prospect it showed of continuous increase. The actual routine work of Bishops was always very heavy, and that was very much added to if the diocese was increasing. They had to arrange for new parishes, new churches, and every new parish and new church added to the Bishop's work when established, and during the process of establishment. A Bishop was able to do much for the benefit of the people in a district and for the benefit of religion by his influence and assistance in new districts. He did not suppose there was anyone in the House, whatever his political or religious opinions might be, who was not anxious to promote religious work in South London, and he therefore asked those who had moved the Amendment to be satisfied with the debate which had taken place on the question, and not to press the Amendment to a division of the House simply to prevent the making of proper arrangements for carrying on the work of the Church of England in South London.

He fully appreciated the reasons which had induced his hon. friends to bring this question forward, and he yielded to no one in his dislike of illegal practices, and he objected to them not merely because they were illegal, but because they were contrary to the Protestant spirit of the Church of England, which was the cause of the Establishment, and which he hoped would always be one of its glories as long as it existed, which he trusted might be a very long time. Although hon. Members who supported this Amendment might be fully justified in insisting, when new bishoprics were being created, that they should have an opportunity of drawing attention to the faults of existing bishoprics, and the deficiencies in the arrangements for enforcing discipline in the Church of England, he did not think it was wise or logical to attempt to prevent new bishoprics being established. If they were not satisfied with the work of the existing Bishops, there was no advantage in preventing them making arrangements for doing their work properly. The very words used in this Amendment—

> "That, in view of the continuance in the Established Church of England and Wales of grave and widespread disorders which the Archbishops and Bishops have failed to restrain,"

were an argument in favour of this Bill. If anything could be done to insist upon a thorough and proper carrying out of the law, if anything could be done to emphasise and maintain the Protestant character of the Church — if it needed emphasis and maintenance, which he very much doubted—it would have his cordial support. But he appealed to hon. Members not to allow themselves, in consequence of any sympathy with extreme notions on the one side, or any dislike of extreme opinions on the other, now that an opportunity had been given for debate—he appealed to the House not to prevent the passing of a measure which was undoubtedly and urgently required for the proper administration of the ecclesiastical organisation in Birmingham and South London. He appealed to the House to give this Bill a Second Reading.

MR. ELLIS GRIFFITH (Anglesey) said the introduction of this Bill had reminded them of the connection which existed between Church and State, and also of the necessity that if the Church of England wanted a new Bishop it must come to Parliament for it. The Church could not manage its own affairs, and it must come to Parliament to get its consent. The last speaker had argued that when the sphere of influence of a Bishop was made smaller the power of mischief would be smaller, and if they had less work to do it would be better for the Church. He knew that the Bishop of Rochester had done a good deal of work in the House of Lords, and if they wanted him to have less to do, the best way to accomplish this would be to deprive him of his power in the House of Lords. If the Bishops did suffer from overwork in this way the right way to deal with that overwork was not to lessen their dioceses but rather to deprive them of their functions in the House of Lords, and thereby enable them to devote all their time to their dioceses. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham had stated that he was a Nonconformist, and that he was still a "Disestablisher." That being so, he thought they must congratulate him on having remained true to at least two of his earlier opinions. It was, however, hardly consistent with the right hon. Gentleman's position as a "Disestablisher" that he should support a Bill to increase the power and the vested interest of a Church which he proposed some day to disestablish. Surely that would make the task of the right hon. Gentleman still harder to disestablish the Church when he had the opportunity. It seemed to him that was not the right way to go about disestablishment if he was in earnest in the matter.

*MR. MARTIN (Worcestershire, Droitwich) desired to support the creation of the new bishopric of Birmingham on behalf of the inhabitants of the county of Worcester. They felt they had in their present Bishop a guiding spirit, and they did not desire him to be so taken up with clerical work as to be unable to devote his time to spiritual work. It was no uncommon thing for the present Bishop to be occupied six or seven hours a day with clerical work. A great deal had been said by way of comparing the work of the Church to that of an army. What would they think if in time of war the generals were compelled to do the staff clerical work instead of devoting their energies to fighting? It was only consistent with common sense to afford the Bishops greater power to regulate the forces of the Church, and to deny them that power would prevent them from carrying on useful work in their dioceses. So far as Worcester was concerned, they did not wish for curtailment in the work of the Church; they rather desired that Church matters should be stimulated. Very few illegal practices were practised there, but there was ample room for the extension of Church work. He, therefore, supported the Bill.

MR. O'MARA (Kilkenny, S.) said an hon. Member opposite had stated that by increasing the number of Bishops they would increase the opposition to the Church of Rome, which he called "the enemy." If that were to be one of the effects of the measure, he would be disposed to vote against it. On the other hand, he found that one of the new Bishops to be created was for Birmingham, and most Members admitted that Birmingham ought to have a Bishop to attend to its spiritual needs. It struck him there was no large town in the country that more required its spiritual needs attended to than Birmingham. If only for the sake of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham he thought the bishopric ought to be created. He agreed that Southwark, which had a large population, ought to have a Bishop. The arguments used by hon. Members opposite made it difficult for him to say how he should vote on this Bill, and he was almost inclined to fall back on the old practice when a doubt of this kind arose, namely, to vote against the Government. He wished to know from the Lord Advocate, the only representative of the Government at present on the Treasury Bench, on whom the costs for the two new bishoprics would fall. Would they fall on public or private funds? [AN HON. MEMBER: Private.] He was satisfied on that point, and would keep an open mind and decide by the further arguments adduced in the debate as to the Lobby he should go into.

MR. MIDDLEMORE (Birmingham, N.) said that his support of all such Bills as that now before the House was necessarily hesitating and nervous. This Bill, like most others, was a compromise between what they approved and what they disapproved. He thought he would be able to show in the course of five minutes why he should vote for the Bill. An hon. Member opposite had brought up the question of disestablishment. He thought that question had a more intimate relation with the right and the wrong of this question than the question that was brought before the House by the hon. Member for Liverpool, although he admitted that that question was of considerable moment. He thought it might be said that Parliament was incompetent to deal effectively with such a question as this. It was incompetent to deal effectively with the spiritual affairs of anybody. Parliament was not a convocation, or a Sanhedrim, or a conference; it was an assembly of Party politicians, who by means best known to themselves had persuaded the electors to send them there till the next election, unless they applied for the Chiltern Hundreds. He would ask with great respect what had Roman Catholics to do with the creation of new Bishops of the Anglican Church any more than they had to do with the creation of Jewish Rabbis? They regarded Anglicans as heretics, although it was true that their heresies were becoming somewhat difficult to perceive. Surely the non-religious had nothing to do with the creation of bishoprics. A large number of the Members of this House were non-religious. Was it not a grave scandal, and almost a blasphemy, that an Atheist should concern himself in these religious matters, even if it was only the establishment of the machinery of religion? If the Athiest uttered the reality within him he certainly would say that no two religions were more radically opposed than his and that of the Church of England. That Church existed to oppose the Atheist, and it might also be said that he existed to oppose this and other Churches, and yet he was asked to vote in favour of this Bill. The same might be said of the Jew. Christians believed that the New Testament gave them a divine guide in religious matters, but the Jew derided their view. But the Jew came here, perhaps, to vote for this Bill.

He admitted that the questions raised by the Amendment were of some moment. If the Church of England progressed towards the Church of Rome with the same rapidity during the next generation as she had during the past generation she would arrive there. She would out-Romanise Rome and would have her extravagancies kept in check from Rome. The Roman Church could do it very much better than the English House of Commons, for she would be kept in check by a spiritual body. He thought some Nonconformists must feel very strongly that as the Church receded more and more from its legal Protestant basis the salaries of the clergy would be drawn more and more from a Church to which they were legally aliens. There was the further question of how far the State ought to interfere in such matters. The creation of these bishoprics was so serious that each of them should be treated in one Bill; and they knew what that would mean. It had really come to this, that Parliament, which was inherently incompetent to deal with those questions, was pressed so much by such matters as they were now discussing that they could not devote themselves adequately to the business of the nation. He was bound to support this Bill. He had given strong reasons for a change in the law. [OPPOSITION cries of "When?"] He had given strong reasons for disestablishment; but when were they to get it? Were they to wait till hon. Gentlemen opposite were to give it? If so, how long would that be? He would appear on any platform with hon. Gentlemen opposite or with hon. Gentlemen on his side of the House, to support the disestablishment of the Church of England; but as to the Amendment, he thought it was an un-Christian act to oppose the development of the Church of England. The diocese of Worcester was overgrown, and the present Bishop could not do justice to it. It really required two Bishops; and, as a Birmingham man, he asked that this Bill should be allowed to pass. He did not think that they ought to wait until some indefinite period when the Opposition were strong enough, or thought they were strong enough, to give the people of England ecclesiastical freedom; and therefore he supported the Bill, which he believed was one of the most pressing needs of the country.

SIR JOHN GORST (Cambridge University) said he intended to vote for the Second Reading of the Bill on a ground which, he thought, over-rode a great many of the arguments used on both sides of the House in the course of the discussion. Southwark was a part of the United Kingdom which contained, he supposed, a much greater proportion of poor and wretched people than any other similar area in the country. Birmingham was not, he thought, exceptionally poor and wretched beyond all the other great manufacturing centres, but it contained many people whose lives were not a credit to our civilisation. Now, in these populations in Southwark and Birmingham there were all sorts of organisations at work endeavouring to improve the condition of the people, which was almost the despair of those who were conscious of that condition, and who desired to see the inhabitants of those cities as well-to-do and as happy as they ought to be. Religion was, perhaps, the most powerful motive which induced the Church and other organisations to make the sacrifices necessary for doing good amongst and improving the condition of these poor people. Those who knew the conditions in which their fellow-citizens lived, should be anxious to give fair play to every kind of organisation and institution in their endeavour to do anything to raise the character of the people.

The Church of England was not the only religious body in the world. There was the Church of Rome, which had active organisations for ameliorating the conditions of the poor; and the Nonconformists and the Salvation Army also exercised a very powerful influence in that direction. But all these other bodies could organise themselves as they thought proper; and if this was a question of those other religious bodies rather than of the Church of England it would not be necessary for them to come to Parliament to ask Parliament to sanction the improvement of those organisations. He would not enter into the question of why it was necessary that the Church of England should have to come to Parliament. For his part, he thought it was very much better that the Church of England should be an Established Church; and he was not, like many of those who had addressed the House, one who believed that the Church of England would be better disestablished. The Church of England was an organised body which must come to Parliament to ask leave to improve its organisation for purposes with which every Member of the House, on both sides, and of every religious persuasion, must have sympathy. He, therefore, asked those hon. Members to help every organisation which desired to work for their benefit amongst the poor and unfortunate classes of the community. Was it not reasonable that Liberals and Conservatives alike, and even hon. Members from Ireland, should agree to enable the Church of England to organise itself in order to grapple with this serious problem? He had heard many speeches about discipline in the Church, and about the legal powers of the Bishops, and the extent to which these powers could be used. But in a case of this kind, where it was merely a question of enabling the Church of England to do that which every other organised community could do without coming to Parliament, it appeared to him only common justice and generosity to give those powers to the Church of England to enable her to make the organisations thought necessary for her welfare and for that of the poorest people in the country. He wished God-speed to the struggle which the Church of England was making with the misery and wretchedness which existed in Southwark and Birmingham.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 279; Noes, 97. (Division List No. 110.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Aird, Sir John
Allhusen,Augustus HenryEden
Allsopp, Hon. George
Ambrose, Robert
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt.Hn.HughO
Arrol, Sir William
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbt. Henry
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hon.Sir H
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt.Hon.A.J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst,Hon.Allen Benjamim
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boland, John
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Bowles,T.Gibson (King's Lynn
Brassey, Albert
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt.Hn.J.A. (Glasgow
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cavendish,V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt.Hon.J.(Birm.
Chamberlain,Rt.HnJ.A.(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Pery A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Rt. Hon. Sir JohnC.R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Crean, Eugene
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Crombie, John William
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cullinan, J.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Davies, SirHoratioD.(Chatham
Delany, William
Denny, Colonel
Dewar,Sir T.R(Tower Hamlets
Dickson, Charles Scott
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dimsdale,Rt.Hon.Sir Joseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland,SirFred Dixon
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Dorington,Rt. Hon.Sir John E.
Douhgty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Dyke,Rt.Hon.Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Emmott, Alfred
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Evans,SirFrancisH.(Maidstone
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.
Fardell, Sir T. George
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Farrell, James Patrick
Fergusson,Rt.Hn.SirJ.(Manc'r.
Ffrench, Peter
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald,Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon.EdwardAlgernon
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Forster, Henry William
Foster, SirMichael (Lond.Univ.
Foster, Philip S.(Warwick,S.W.
Fyler, John Arthur
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gilhooly, James
Godson, SirAugustusFrederick
Gore,Hn.G.R.C.Ormsby-(Salop
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray,Ernest (West Ham)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Gunter, Sir Robert
Hain, Edward
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hamilton, RtHnLordG(Midd'x
Hamilton,Marq of(L'nd'nderry
Hammond, John
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th
Harris, Dr. Fredk. R. (Dulwich
Harwood, George
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hayden, John Patrick
Heath, A. Howard (Hanley)
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford,W.
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hozier, Hon.James HenryCecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Hutton, John (Yorks., N.R.)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Joyce, Michael
Kennaway, Rt.Hon. SirJohnH.
Kenyon, Hon.Geo.T.(Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
Knowles, Sir Lees
Lambton, Hon. FrederickWm.
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)

Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.
Lawrence, Sir Jos. (Monmouth)
Lawson, Jn. G. (Yorks., N.R.)
Leamy, Edmund
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hon. W. (Bristol, S.)
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lundon, W.
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell, Rt. Hn. Sir H. E (Wigt'n
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.
Middlemore, John Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Mitchell, William (Burnley)
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murphy, John
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Jas. (Roscommon, N.)
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Partington, Oswald
Percy Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Reid, James (Greenock)
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green)
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Roche, John
Rollitt, Sir Albert K.
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rose, Charles Day
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G.
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Sir Harry S. (Limehouse
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, H C. (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col Sir C. E. H. (Sheffield
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt-Col. A. C. E. (Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.)
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-und-Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, J. W. Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W. H. (Yorks.
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R (Bath)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Young, Samuel
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Asher, Alexander
Austin, Sir John
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Black, Alexander William
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Brigg, John
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Charrington, Spencer
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Dewar, John A. Inverness-sh.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Ellice, Capt E C (S. Andrw's Bghs
Fenwick, Charles
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flynn, James Christopher
Furness, Sir Christopher
Griffith, Ellis J.
Harcourt, Lewis V. (Rossendale
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Houston, Robert Paterson
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Kilbride, Denis
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Lloyd-George, David
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Moore, William
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Norman, Henry
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham)
Perks, Robert William
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee
Roe, Sir Thomas
Russell, T. W.

Sandys, Lieut.-Col.Thos. Myles
Saunderson, Rt.Hn.Col.Edw.J.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, RtHn.C.R.(Northants
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomas, David Alfred(Merthyr
Tomkinson, James
Wallace, Robert
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Weir, James Galloway
White Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.
Wilson John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Charles M'Arthur and Mr. Brynmor Jones.

Main Question put accordingly.

The House divided :—Ayes, 282; Noes, 85. (Division List No. 111.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Aird, Sir John
Allhusen, Augustus Hen. Eden
Allsopp, Hon. George
Ambrose, Robert
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O
Arrol, Sir William
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt.Hn. Sir H.
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour,Rt.Hon.A. J.(Manch'r.
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey).
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (Leeds)
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst,Hon. Allen Benjamin
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boland, John
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Campbell,Rt.Hn.J.A.(Glasgow
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cavendish, V.C.W.(Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J.(Birm.
Chamberlain,Rt.Hn.J.A(Worc.
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Rt. Hon. Sir J. C. R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Crean, Eugene
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Crombie, John William
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cullinan, J.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Davies,SirHoratio D.(Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dewar,Sir T.R(Tower Hamlets
Dickson, Charles Scott
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dimsdale, Rt. Hn.Sir JosephC.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland,SirFred Dixon
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Dorington, Rt.Hon.Sir JohnE.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Emmott, Alfred
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Evans,SirFrancisH.(Maidstone
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Farrell, James Patrick
Fergusson, Rt. Sir J. (Manc'r.)
Ffrench, Peter
Finch, Rt. Hon George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, SirRobert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Forster, Henry William
Foster, P. S. (Warwick, S.W.)
Fyler, John Arthur
Galloway, William Johnson
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gilhooly, James
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Gordon,MajEvans-(T'rH'mlets
Gore,Hn G.R.C.Ormsby-(Salop
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Green,Walford D(Wednesbury)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Gunter, Sir Robert
Hain, Edward
Hamilton,RtHnLord G(Midd'x
Hamilton,Marq.of(L'nd'nderry
Hammond, John
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th)
Harris, Dr. Fredk. R. (Dulwich
Harwood, George
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hayden, John Patrick
Heath, Arthur Howard(Hanley
Helder, Augustus
Henderson,Sir A. (Stafford,W.)
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hogg, Lindsay
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hozier, Hon.James HenryCecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Hutton, John (Yorks., N.R.)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon.Arthur Fred.
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Joyce, Michael
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T.(Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney Col. W. (Salop)
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
Knowles, Sir Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Law,Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.)
Lawrence, Sir J. (Monmouth)
Lawson, John G. (Yorks., N.R.
Leamy, Edmund
Lee, A.H.(Hants., Fareham)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long,Col.CharlesW.(Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hn. W. (Bristol, S.)
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J.(Portsmouth
Lundon, W.

Lyell, Charles Henry
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M‘Fadden, Edward
M‘Hugh, Patrick A.
M‘Iver, Sir Lewis(Edinburgh W
M‘Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
M‘Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell, Rt. Hn. Sir H. E(Wigt'n
Maxwell, W. J. H.(Dumfriesshire
Middlemore, John Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt. Hon. Sir Frederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Mitchell, William (Burnley)
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morgan, David J(Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Moulton, John Fletcher
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Rt. Hn A. Graham(Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, Kendal(Tipperary Mid.
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James(Wicklow, W.)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, James(Roscommon, N.
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Partington, Oswald
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R
Power, Patrick Joseph
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E.(Waterford)
Reid, James (Greenock)
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Ridley, Hon. M. W.(Stalybridge)
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Roche, John
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rose, Charles Day
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Sir Harry S.(Limehouse
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, H. C(North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Spencer, Sir E.(W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M‘Taggart
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Rt. Hn J. G.(Oxf'd Univ.
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. H (Sheffield
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E(Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G. E.(Notts.)
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, J. W.(Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R.(Bath)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Young, Samuel
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES.—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Asher, Alexander
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Black, Alexander William
Brigg, John
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Delany, William
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Ellice, Capt E. C(S. Andrw'sBghs
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flynn, James Christopher
Furness, Sir Christopher
Harcourt, Lewis V.(Rossendale
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Houston, Robert Paterson
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor(Swansea
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Kilbride, Denis
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Leese, Sir Joseph F.(Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Lloyd-George, David
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M‘Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M‘Crae, George
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Norman, Henry
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
Palmer, Sir Charles M.(Durham)
Perks, Robert William
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Russell, T. W.
Sandys, Lt.-Col. Thos. Myles
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soares, Ernest J.
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred(Merthyr)
Wallace, Robert
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)

Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES.—Mr. Ellis Griffith and Mr. Slack.

Bill read a second time.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I beg to move that the Bill be referred to the Standing Committee on Law.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be committed to the Standing Committee on Law, etc."—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs) opposed the Motion on the ground that the Bill was a contentious measure in regard to which much difference of opinion had been expressed, and the Prime Minister himself had laid down the proposition that no Bill of a contentious character ought to be sent to a Committee upstairs. There was no great rush of Government business, and he submitted that the Bill ought to be considered in Committee of the Whole House so that all Members would have an opportunity of expressing their views. Moreover, supporters of the Bill had brought forward questions of principle, and, inasmuch as principles could not be discussed upstairs, that was an additional reason for keeping the measure in the House. But if it was to go to a Standing Committee, he submitted that the Committee on Trade was more suitable than that on Law.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tryone, S.) had grave doubts as to whether the Bill ought to go upstairs. He remembered the scenes which took place when the Church Discipline Bill was referred to a Standing Committee, and how that measure was practically forced through by Mr. Gladstone's influence. The Bill would probably take longer to pass through the Standing Committee than through a Committee of the House, and the Government would regret having sent it upstairs.

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax) thought there ought to be some understanding as to the Bills to be referred to Standing Committees. An unexpected notice had appeared on the Paper with reference to the Aliens Bill, and personally he would be prepared to agree to the present measure going upstairs if the Prime Minister would agree to allow the Aliens Bill to be discussed in a Committee of the Whole House.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS (Glamorganshire, Mid.) hoped the Prime Minister would not press his Motion. Experience had shown that it was a mistake to send legislation of this description, which aroused strong feeling, to a Standing Committee. A prolonged fight was certain to ensue. Amendments would be manufactured, obstruction, legitimate or otherwise, resorted to, and then when the Bill came back to the House the whole fight would be gone over again, with the result that much more time would be occupied than if the measure had been considered by the House in the ordinary way. Moreover, this was not the class of Bill that ought to be sent upstairs. Only measures to which there was practically no objection on principle should be so referred. Business men and lawyers were heavily penalised by having to attend the House at two o'clock under the new Rules, but it would be practically impossible for practising legal Gentlemen to get down in time to take part in the deliberations of the Standing Committee on this Bill.

SIR J. FERGUSSON (Manchester, N.E.) reminded the House that the Benefices Bill, which was certainly as contentious as the measure under consideration, was satisfactorily and thoroughly discussed before the Standing Committee on Law.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs) said that, according to his recollection of the measure referred to by the right hon. Baronet, the discussion in the Standing Committee did not at all assist the Bill. So considerable was the discussion when the Bill came again before the House that it was not passed in either its first or its second session, and it succeeded in getting through in its third session only in a truncated form. The discussion on the present Bill had turned on questions of disestablishment, the qualifications of Bishops, ritual, and doctrine; the debate upstairs would doubtless proceed on similar lines, and it was absurd to suggest that a Committee of lawyers was the best tribunal for settling questions of that character. The Bill was exceedingly controversial, and when Standing Committees were first set up the Prime Minister was one of their strongest critics, because he feared that Bills of a controversial character would be referred to them. In the present case the greatest importance attached to the details of the measure, to the powers to be conferred on the Bishops, and yet in those questions the House was to have no voice whatever. There appeared to be a disposition to rush through a Bill of this character. He had often seen pressure exercised by majorities upon that Committee to vote down every Amendment, however reasonable and fair. He could understand a Bill of this sort being sent to the Standing Committee in order to save time, but did the Prime Minister really think that under the new Rule any time would be saved by adopting this course? Hon. Members who were really interested in this question were not members of the Standing Committee on Law. They would not, for instance, on that Committee have the benefit of the advice of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham. In the interests of saving time he thought the Prime Minister would be well advised in withdrawing his Motion to refer the Bill to the Standing Committee. If the Prime Minister was intent upon sending highly controversial matters of this kind to the Standing Committee on Law he would remind him that he was setting up a precedent for the future of a rather dangerous character.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I am rather puzzled to understand the change of opinion on the part of the hon. Member opposite with regard to the effect of sending up Bills to the Standing Committee, for I remember great struggles taking place in which the hon. Member himself took part in order to get private Bills sent up to that Committee.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: Not controversial Bills.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The Employers' Liability Bill and the Deceased Wife's Sister Bill.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: It was a very fatal precedent. The Bill was killed.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: But they did not take that course in order to kill the Bill. I presume, therefore, that as far as hon. Gentlemen opposite are concerned when their own measures are being dealt with they take a somewhat different view of the effect of a Standing Committee than they do when other people's Bills are under consideration. They do not then regard the Standing Committee as a mere manufactory of Amendments, or as a place where great delay might occur. Of course the more important question is whether this is or is not an appropriate Bill to send to the Standing Committee. I can hardly imagine a Bill more clearly in the category of those which ought to be dealt with by a Standing Committee than this Bill. The hon. Gentleman has remarked that disestablishment and various important theological topics have been discussed in the debate; but that is because there has been an Amendment to the Second Reading in no sense touching the principle of the Bill. What the Bill really does is to deal with certain localities, and there is no general principle contained in the measure at all, unless you call it a general principle that this House is not to impede the work of the Established Church. I do not think it would be in order on the Committee stage to discuss the larger questions which have been raised to-day, though I do not pass judgment on the propriety of discussing whether the new Bishops should sit in the House of Lords. What powers of obstruction there may be if those questions are discussed I cannot say, but I hope that hon. Gentlemen, however much they dislike anything which conduces to the spiritual efficiency of the Church of England—[Cries of "Oh."]—If I have said anything which hurts hon. Members' feelings I withdraw it, though I cannot understand their conduct unless there is some object of that kind behind it. If, however, they say they have no such object, I accept the disclaimer. This is a local measure, and ought, on its merits, really to be dealt with by Provisional Order. That form, however, has not been adopted, and we have to take the machinery of this House as we find it. But surely we are putting that machinery to its most legitimate use when we ask that one stage of this local ecclesiastical Bill shall not occupy the whole time of all the Members of this House. I do not think a case has been made out for any opposition to this Motion. I deeply regret the tone which has been adopted by the hon. Gentleman opposite. As to the statement, amounting almost to a threat, made by the hon. Member opposite, the responsibility for the course referred to will rest with the hon. Member and not with me.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford) said the Prime Minister had spoken of those who opposed this Motion as being animated by hostility to the Bill. That statement might be true of some of those who had spoken but it was not true in regard to himself. For reasons which the House would readily understand he had not ventured to intervene in the debate upon the previous stages of the Bill. He felt somewhat embarrassed in the matter. But this was one of the embarrassments they suffered from in being forced to come to this House. He now found himself forced to vote one way or the other upon a question affecting the discipline of the Established Church. He might say he had already exercised his vote not in hostility to this measure but in favour of it. It was, therefore, not from any hostility to this Bill that he opposed this Motion, but because he regarded the practice of sending, year after year, controversial measures to Standing Committees as a growing danger which deprived private Members of full control over questions which were not matters of agreement. The Prime Minister had stated that he could not conceive a Bill which was more suited to go to a Standing Committee, but in his opinion he could not conceive a measure of a more controversial character than this one, and upon that broad principle he should vote against this Motion.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis) said that like his hon. and learned friend the Member for Waterford he had already voted for this Bill, but it seemed to him that there was no Standing Committee to which it could be appropriately referred. He had the strongest possible objection to referring anything to a Standing Committee, because it was taking away from the House of Commons the business that most properly belonged to it, and business which it could most profitably do. He had never known a Bill discussed in Committee of the House without suggestions of the most valuable kind being made, and very often adopted by the Minister in charge of the measure. He had never known a Bill pass through the Committee stage of the House of Commons without being enormously improved. It was for want of adequate discussion in the House of Commons that measures became failures, and everything that tended to withdraw a measure having any element of controversy in it from the Committee of the House was not in the interests of good legislation. A debate on the Report stage was not the same thing as a debate in Committee, and it had not the same effect, for it did not produce the same suggestions, and they could only speak once. The result was that the debate on the Report stage was not productive of the same benefit as a debate in Committee of the Whole House. This was a very dangerous practice and he hoped his right hon. friend would not press his Motion to a division.

MR. ELLIS GRIFFITH said it had been stated that this was not a contentious measure, but when he saw the right hon. Gentleman strike the box before him he thought it was strange that he should show so much heat in discussing a non-contentious measure. If a Bill proposing two additional Bishops was not contentious, he wondered how a Bill would be described if it proposed to take away two Bishops. He should very much like to hear the view of hon. Members opposite if such a Bill were introduced on that side. In reference to what the Prime Minister said as to the way in which private Members Bills were dealt with, he pointed out that the Government had command of the time of the House in a way which was not open to private Members. Why that argument had been introduced was beyond his comprehension. He was not going to consider the question whether the Committee on Trade or the Committee on Law was best fitted to deal with the Bill. His hon. friend had referred to the Amendment standing in his name on the Paper as one that ought not to be discussed.

* **Mr. SPEAKER**: I understand that you are speaking of the Instruction which he has on the Paper. That Instruction is out of order on the ground that it is mandatory.

Mr. ELLIS GRIFFITH said that though his proposal was not in order as an Instruction, it could be put in the form of an Amendment here or upstairs as the case might be. An Amendment proposing to prevent two new Bishops from sitting in the House of Lords was clearly one of those important matters that ought to be discussed before a Committee of this House. He thought the Prime Minister would best consult the interests of the Government from the point of view of time by acceding to the proposal they were making and not insisting or taking a course which would in the end militate against the progress of the Bill.

Mr. FLYNN (Cork County, N.) said he associated himself with the protest against the growing practice of withdrawing from the consideration of this House a large amount of contentious matter. The right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury had been most unhappy in the precedents he had quoted. The Government were masters of the time of the House, and private Members were not. The hon. Member for the Kirkcaldy Burghs made a dangerous suggestion when he said the Bill should be referred to the Committee on Trade. He would remind the hon. Member that the Committee on Trade had most important Bills to deal with—the Butter Bill for example—and it would be unfair to send to that hard-worked Committee the Bill now before the House. He also objected to the Bill being sent to the Committee on Law on the ground that this was a measure which should be considered by Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HUMPHREYS-OWEN (Montgomeryshire) suggested that the Bill be sent to a Select Committee.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place, and claimed to move that the Question be now put.

Question put "That the Question be now put."

The House divided:—Ayes, 242; Noes, 120. (Division List No. 112.)

AYES.

Aird, Sir John
Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Allsopp, Hon. George
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir H.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn. Gerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Campbell, J. H. M. (Dublin Univ.
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A. (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Rt. Hon. Sir John C. R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Dewar, Sir T. R. (Tower Hamlets
Dickson, Charles Scott
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dimsdale, Rt. Hon. Sir Joseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W.

Fyler, John Arthur
Galloway, William Johnson
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Godson,Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon,MajEvans-(T'rH'mlets
Gore,HnG.R.C. Ormsby-(Salop
Gorst,Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Green,WalfordD.(Wednesbury
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Gunter, Sir Robert
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton,RtHnLordG (Midd'x
Hamilton,Marq.of(L'nd'nderry
Hardy,Laurence(Kent'Ashford
Harris,F.Leverton (Tynem'th)
Harris,Dr.Fredk. R. (Dulwich)
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath,Arthur Howard (Hanley
Helder, Augustus
Henderson,Sir A.(Stafford,W.)
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope,J.F.(Sheffield, Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hozier, Hon. JamesHenryCecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Hutton, John (Yorks., N.R.)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys,Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Kennaway,Rt.Hon.Sir JohnH.
Kenyon,Hon.Geo.T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney,Col. W. (Salop.
Kerr, John
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Sir Lees
Laurie, Lieut-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence,SirJoseph(Monm'th)
Lawson,Jhn.Grant(Yorks.N.R.
Lee,ArthurH.(Hants.,Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol, S.
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas,ReginaldJ.(Portsmouth)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Calmont, Colonel James
M'Iver,SirLewis(EdinburghW.
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell,RtHnSirH.E.(Wigt'n
Maxwell,W.J.H(Dumfriesshire
Middlemore,JohnThrogmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner,Rt.Hon.Sir FrederickG.
Milvain, Thomas
Mitchell, William (Burnley)
Montagu,Hon.J.Scott (Hants.)
Morgan,DavidJ.(Walthamstow
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray,RtHn.A.Graham(Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Peel,Hn.Wm.Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Reid, James (Greenock)
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Ridley,Hon.M.W. (Stalybridge
Ridley,S.Forde (Bethnal Green
Ritchie,Rt.Hon.Chas.Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel,Sir HarryS.(Limehouse
Sandys,Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith,HC.(North'mb.Tyneside
Smith,James Parker(Lanarks.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley,EdwardJas.(Somerset)
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot,Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'd Univ.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent,Col.SirC.E.H(Sheffield
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond, Rt.Hn.SirWilliam H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col.A.C.E(Taunton
Welby,Sir Charles G.E.(Notts.)
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley,H. (Ashton-und-Lyne
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson,J.W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson-Todd, SirW.H.(Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt.Hn.E.R.(Bath)
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Young, Samuel
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork,N.E.)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Asher, Alexander
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brigg, John
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Crean, Eugene
Crombie, John William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Ellice, Capt E. C(SAndr's Bghs
Emmott, Alfred
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Evans,SirFrancisH.(Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Farrell, James Patrick
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Ffrench, Peter
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Furness, Sir Christopher

Gilhooly, James
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert Jn.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Griffith, Ellis J.
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Lewis V. (Rossendale
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kilbride, Denis
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Moulton, John Fletcher
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary, Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Malley, William
Partington, Oswald
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Rea, Russell
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Roche, John
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Slack, John Bamford
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R. (Northants
Sullivan, Donal
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, D. Alfred (Merthyr)
Tomkinson, James
Wason, Jn. Cathcart (Orkney)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Herbert Roberts and Mr. Humphreys-Owen.

Question put accordingly.

The House divided:— Ayes, 236; Noes, 120. (Division List No. 113.)

AYES.

Aird, Sir John
Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Allsopp, Hon. George
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline Fitzroy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Baird, John George Alexander
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Campbell, J. H. M. (Dublin Univ.
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A. (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Rt. Hon. Sir John C. R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Dewar, Sir T. R. (Tower Hamlets
Dickson, Charles Scott
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dimsdale, Rt. Hon. Sir Joseph C.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fison, Frederick William
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S.W.)
Fyler, John Arthur
Galloway, William Johnson
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Gordon, Maj. Evans-(T. H'mlets
Gore, Hn. G. R. C. Ormsby-(Salop
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Green, Walford D (Wednesbury
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Gunter, Sir Robert
Hain, Edward
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'd'nderry
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th)
Harris, Dr. Fredk. R. (Dulwich
Harwood, George
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hogg, Lindsay
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Hutton, John (Yorks., N.R.)
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.

Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Joicey, Sir James
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Kerr, John
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Knowles, Sir Lees
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks. N.R
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S)
Lowe, Francis William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Calmont, Colonel James
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W.
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell, Rt Hn. Sir H. E. (Wigt'n
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.)
Middlemore, Jn. Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G
Milvain, Thomas
Mitchell, William (Burnley)
Montagu, Hn. J. Scott (Hants.)
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Reid, James (Greenock)
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Sir H. S. (Limehouse)
Sandys, Lt.-Col. Thos. Myles
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. H. (Sheff'ld
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E. (Taunton
Welby, Sir Chas. G. E. (Notts.)
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh., N.)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W. H. (Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Asher, Alexander
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Brigg, John
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Crean, Eugene
Crombie, John William
Cullinan, J.
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Ellice, Capt. E. C. (S Andrw's Bghs
Emmott, Alfred
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Evans, Sir F. H. (Maidstone)
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Farrell, James Patrick
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Ffrench, Peter
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gilhooly, James
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herb. John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Lewis V. (Rossendale
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jones, D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kilbride, Denis
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Leamy, Edmund
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lundon, W.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Crae, George
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nolan, Col. J. P. (Galway, N.)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)
O Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)

O'Dowd, John
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
Partington, Oswald
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rea, Russell
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Roche, John
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt.Hn.C.R(Northants
Sullivan, Donal
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, D. Alfred (Merthyr)
Tomkinson, James
Ure, Alexander
Wason, Jn. Cathcart (Orkney)
White, Luke (York. E.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Ellis Griffith and Mr. Dalziel.

Bill committed to the Standing Committee on Law, etc.

FOREIGN SHIPS (APPLICATION OF STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS).

Order read for resuming adjourned debate on Question [3rd May], "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire to what extent the Statutory Requirements applying to British ships trading to and from ports in the United Kingdom should be made applicable to foreign vessels trading to and from such ports."—(*Mr. Gerald Balfour.*)

Question again proposed.

MR. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid.) said he did not intend to oppose the Motion, but he thought an explanation regarding it should be given. Further, he thought the Motion was unnecessary, because the Board of Trade was in possession of all the facts for the purpose of determining what regulations should be made regarding foreign ships; and he was surprised that the Department did not introduce a Bill on its own responsibility. Not only was the Motion unnecessary, but it was inexpedient; because there was nothing from which British commerce suffered so much as investigations by the House of Commons, which were designed to hit the foreigner, and which had the effect of stimulating the foreigner against this country.

MR. O'MARA (Kilkenny, S.) said that the Resolution appeared in an unusual form, because it did not contain the names of the members of the Committee. He had no objection to the inquiry, which he thought would be productive of nothing but good, especially if the members of the Committee were practical men like the hon. Member for Mid Lanarkshire, who was a hard-headed Scotsman. He had heard complaints about foreign ships which were not subject to the Board of Trade regulations entering British ports. For instance, ships laden with timber from Scandinavia frequently entered British ports with immense deck loads which would not be allowed on British ships.

Question put, and agreed to.

Ordered, That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire to what extent the Statutory Requirements applying to British ships trading to and from ports in the United Kingdom should be made applicable to Foreign vessels trading to and from such ports.

EVENING SITTING.

CRIMINAL LAW AND PROCEDURE (IRELAND) ACT, 1887.

*MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.) said that for the second time this session, by making use of the few remaining privileges of private Members, he had an opportunity of opening a discussion on a matter of great importance to Irishmen. He laboured under a disadvantage in bringing forward the Motion which stood in his name by reason that he had not suffered under the English coercion Government. But whether they had suffered or not there remained to the Irish people a smarting sense of injustice because as a nation they were open to the operation of this law. For that reason he welcomed the opportunity of exposing once more the falsity of the contention so frequently set up by English people that Ireland was governed by the same system of law that obtained in England. The whole history of Ireland since the Union refuted that statement. Only a few weeks previously he had been able to expose the hollowness of that contention in dealing with the system under which the law was administered with regard to what were called malicious injuries. He had been able to show that in the administration of the system a totally different procedure was followed to that of England. The only justification for the law was to be found in the contention which the Government were not able to uphold, namely, that in Ireland the people lived in a state of continuous riot. In no other way could they justify levying compensation for damage on innocent persons. Yet that was the system of law which obtained in Ireland. This was, however, a small matter compared to that to which he wished to draw attention.

The coercion laws, of which about eighty had been passed in the last century, culminated in the monstrous Act which was still a disgrace to the Statute-book, the law of 1887. Whatever reason could be put forward for temporary legislation of exceptional character, the English people could have no justification for placing on the Statute-book a permanent Coercion Act. So long as that Act disgraced the Statute-book of England, Englishmen ought to give up their attitude of unctuous rectitude and admit that the contention that Ireland was governed by similar laws to those which obtained in England was nothing but a travesty of the truth. If the contention that this Act was necessary for Ireland was based upon the prevalence of criminality in Ireland, then he would say that over and over again that had been refuted, because Ireland had an infinitely better record in this respect than either Scotland or England. The real object the Government had in carrying through that Act was to buttress up the rotten system of landlordism in Ireland. That system had now been condemned by the Prime Minister and the House had avowed its desire that land in Ireland should revert to its rightful owners. Presumably, therefore, they rested their contention on the prevalence of agrarian offences. The total number of agrarian offences reported in Ireland in 1903 was 195, out of which there were nineteen convictions, six cases which were made amenable to the Act, and 169 cases with regard to which there were no convictions and no one was made amenable. Of that 195 cases, eighty-three were for the offence of sending threatening letters, with regard to which there were no convictions, and forty-two for incendiary fires, with regard to which only two were made amenable, and there were no convictions. During the same year there were nine offences reported of maiming cattle, and in spite of the diligence of the police —and those living in Ireland knew on what a policeman depended for his promotion—there were no convictions. On the Third Reading of this Coercion Act, in 1887, Mr. Gladstone, whose name and whose speeches were, he thought, not sufficiently heard in this House, said—

> "The new coercion . . . aims at association. Association is the only weapon whereby the many and the poor can redress the inequality of their struggle with wealth, influence, power, and administrative authority."

The chief objections that they in Ireland had to the existence of this Act were, first of all, that it abrogated the right possessed by every citizen of the British Empire of a trial by jury, and thus struck at the foundation of the freedom of the people. Secondly, they objected to the constitution of the tribunal by which the Coercion Act was administered — two magistrates chosen by the Government, paid by them, and removable by them. Thirdly, that the venue rested with the Attorney-General —of course, it might be said that there was a right of appeal, but those who were acquainted with Ireland knew that if an appeal were demanded there was very little chance of success. A new and very dangerous element had made its appearance in the last few years, which was that the police had become, not the judge of what a man who exercised the right of free speech did say, but of what that man might say. Hon. Members would remember the Kilmaine case, in which the hon. Member for East Clare was allowed by the policeman to address the meeting, but in which the Member in whose constituency the meeting was held was brutally restrained from addressing his constituents on a matter of public importance, and exercising the right of free speech. Another objection to this Act was that the Lord-Lieutenant, probably an Englishman, or in his absence two landlords acting with others, had authority to assume the functions of Parliament by putting into operation a law in the interest of their class which should not be put into operation until this House had had an opportunity of deciding that it should be put into operation. Finally, they objected to it because it was monstrous that, by a majority of English votes in this House, people in responsible positions in Ireland should be deprived of the right of free speech. Coercion was the last result of a discredited Government. It was invariably put into operation for the reason that the Government of the day had lost the sympathy of their landlord supporters, and desired to court popularity with them. How long was this attitude to be maintained? Was it to be maintained until, the last parcel of land having reverted to its rightful owner, the reason for this Act would be gone? He urged the House to adopt a nobler policy; to free Ireland from an unmerited charge of criminality, and to rescue itself from the disgrace that attached to its toleration of an injustice.

MR. HAVILAND BURKE (King's County, Tullamore) seconded the Motion. The strongest argument against Home Rule on Unionist platforms was on the declaration that they would grant to Ireland every right that England enjoyed, and Lord Randolph Churchill, when he declared the policy of "similarity and simultaneity," used words that had the assent of the Cabinet. He charged hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite with having violated the professions of honour on the faith of which they secured their return to Parliament. They obtained power on those professions, and they were now displaying a perfidy which was almost unexampled in Irish politics by maintaining the Coercion Act. It was said that there was a right of appeal against sentences under the Coercion Act, but to whom did it lie? He did not for a moment dispute the fact that there had been a considerable number of cases in which sentences had been reduced and mitigated. But the fact remained that the appeal was to the County Court Judges, a number of whom had very little legal experience, and had been appointed for partisan services they had rendered. In his opinion the House had been rather too strict with regard to criticisms on Judges. It was too soon to forget that the first thing it did after the deposition of James II. was to set itself to control the dangerous and growing power of the Judges of the realm. What was the original tribunal? A resident magistrate could be appointed, promoted, retired, or dismissed by the Lord-Lieutenant. He need have no legal qualification, and he was the only official in the three kingdoms who had it in his power to prohibit a public meeting, to command, perhaps, hundreds of armed policemen to suppress a meeting, to order them to fire upon, bayonet, or baton men, to order what arrests he might think necessary, and to sit in judgment upon those arrested. He knew absolutely nothing to compare with that in any part of the British Empire.

It was the proud boast of English law that there was on its administration a strict separation between the judiciary and the executive—a divorce had been studiously maintained between the police who detected crime and the magistrate before whom the offender was charged, as well as between the magistrate who committed for trial and the Judge who tried the case. But it was very different in Ireland, where the resident magistrate was in the habit of dining with the local police inspector and local landlord and discussing the chances of a successful prosecution, and then entering into communication with the law officers of the Crown in Dublin as to how best the meshes of the law could be put around the accused. The right hon. Gentleman, as representing the Government, had been in repeated and continuous communication with local resident magistrates and local district inspectors with a view of entrapping his fellow Members in that House and getting them into prison. When the Coercion Act was introduced the present Leader of the House, who was then Chief Secretary for Ireland, had the idea that by establishing a system of awarding the degradation of hard labour he was doing a brilliant stroke of business; that men who might cheerfully submit to simple imprisonment would shrink from the odium involved in a sentence of hard labour. But that idea had been blown into thin air, and at the present moment no man was a penny the worse, even among Unionists, for having been sentenced to hard labour. He could mention one case in which while a man was undergoing a sentence of hard labour the wife of a distinguished legal Unionist at Trinity College, at her husband's request, visited him. This proved that no social degradation attached to Irish politicians from that cause. The Irish Executive, apart from the Crimes Act, was armed with enormous powers. There was no other part of the United Kingdom where steps could be taken with greater promptitude or with greater severity against anybody suspected of a desire to incite to crime or outrage. Formalities which were absolutely indispensable in this country were not required in Ireland. In Ireland, for instance, there was no Riot Act. Any superior policeman in charge had the right to order the men under him to fire at the people at a moment's notice. ["No, no!"] Hon. Members cried "No, no," but he knew what he was saying. He did not want their instruction.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON (Armagh, N.): It looks as if you do.

MR. HAVILAND BURKE said he wished hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite would conduct the argument with good manners and temper. One might expect from them at least common courtesy. The fact was that in England no shot could be fired on the people even in most extreme cases until the Riot Act had been read. In Ireland there was no Riot Act or any notice or warning required. Any solicitor's clerk ought to know that. [MINISTERIAL cries of "No, no!" and counter cries of "Mitchelstown."] He repeated that the reading of the Riot Act in Ireland was not a necessary preliminary to firing on the people. In conclusion he would advise those who thought that the Irish were an abnormally criminal people to read the horrible weekly record of immorality and ruffianism presented by the London Sunday papers. In face of those records could it be honourably contended that the Irish were an abnormally criminal people? He would furthermore ask them to note that it was a common complaint of magistrates and police inspectors in all the large English towns that they were unable to cope with crime owing to the reluctance of the people to prosecute because of the terrorism brought to bear on them by the habitual criminals who organised those crimes. Only last Sunday there was reported a case in which three constables arresting a couple of well-known habitual and dangerous criminals were opposed by a mob of sympathisers and almost cut to ribbons, having to fight for their lives until reinforcements came up. Why was there not a special Coercion Act to meet that state of things? He did not for a moment delude himself with the idea that he could successfully appeal against the revengeful and bitter political spirit which devoted its energies, not to providing remedies for existing evils or in improving the condition of the country, but to concerting absurd schemes to disfranchise fellow Irishmen. That was a disagreeable phenomenon of the situation which it was difficult to explain away, but he would appeal for action in the direction of increasing and enlarging the liberties of Ireland.

It might be said that recourse was very seldom had to the Crimes Act, but surely that could not be accepted as an argument in favour of an intrinsically vicious measure. The fact remained that while they were talking about equal rights for all men they had in operation in Ireland an Act of Parliament under which, by a scratch of the pen, an official in Dublin Castle could do away with the right of trial by jury. While this country waged a great war on the ground of equal rights for all white men, here in the very heart of the British Empire they were depriving the Irish nation of the rights enjoyed by the people of England, Scotland, and Wales. The Irish Party had been treated with consistent and insistent injustice. On their own side of the water the Nationalist Members were not infrequently denounced with great bitterness because they did not go far enough, because they were not sufficiently extreme, because they consented even to go to St. Stephen's, and because they did not relinquish the representation of Ireland to Orangemen and landlords. On the other hand they were accused of being desperadoes secretly encouraging crime and screening the criminals. Let hon. Members opposite instead of tampering with the question of numerical Parliamentary representation, try to do something to remove the grievances which justly gave rise to these feelings of bitterness; let them seek to fulfil the pledges of their leaders and to make peace while there was yet time.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That, in the opinion of this House, the presence of the Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) Act on the Statute-book is a gross violation of the Constitution, without parallel in any other portion of His Majesty's dominions, and that the Act should be immediately repealed."—(*Mr. Boland.*)

MR. WILLIAM MOORE (Antrim, N.) said he would be very happy to submit to any penalty the hon. Member opposite might suggest if he could point to a single section of the Crimes Act or any other Act which altered the provisions of the Riot Act as applied to Ireland. Again and again in Belfast there had been riots, generally provoked by the friends of hon. Members opposite, and in every case a Belfast magistrate had accompanied the police when the Riot Act had been read. Why the hon. Member should take it upon himself to say so authoritatively that it was within the knowledge of any solicitor's clerk in Ireland that the law there was different from the law in England in that respect he could not understand. It was scarcely necessary to say that Members from Ulster were going to oppose this Motion. He had listened in vain for any statement of glaring injustice or grievance arising out of this Act.

MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): You were never on a plank bed.

MR. WILLIAM MOORE: I have never earned that, thank God.

A NATIONALST MEMBER: No, you would rather go on the Front Bench.

MR. WILLIAM MOORE said he was about to remark that if the hon. Members had a grievance, he did not think they would say that Members from Ulster would be slow to back them. They had often joined hands together before on Irish grievances, and he believed they were willing to do so again; but the cardinal fact for the public to remember was that they had 1,250,000 people at home who found no grievance in this Act, who had prospered under it, who had carried on their trade under it, and who had no complaint as to prejudice to their life, liberty, or property. Surely that knocked a hole in the arguments that had been put forward about injury, injustice, and oppression to Ireland. This Act which they were now considering was one which at present, so far as he knew, was, except for one section, not in force in any part of Ireland. There might be proclaimed districts; but, if so, he did not know them. What hon. Members opposite complained of was that there were exceptional dormant powers which might be put into force by the Lord-Lieutenant in Council when exceptional circumstances arose, but not till then, and he put it to the common sense of any subject in the United Kingdom, that if exceptional circumstances in any district were unfortunately again to occur, why should they not have exceptional legislation to deal with them? He really thought hon. Members opposite were rather unreasonable. They had got the substance, and yet they would persist in straining after the shadow. This was a mere matter of administration in Ireland. He would explain what he meant by saying that hon. Members opposite had got the substance. An ex-colleague of theirs was now the highest permanent official in the Board of Agriculture. They had also an active and keen sympathiser in Sir A. MacDonnell, who was quite prepared to go their length in compensating evicted tenants who had broken the law, on the University question, and on various other topics which hon. Members had at heart. They had the whole local government representation of the country in their hands. Then in Ballinasloe a resident medical superintendent had been passed over for practically the only appointment open to him in favour of a junior who happened to belong to the predominant religion. Therefore, they had also the substance in the Lunatic Asylums Department. A Unionist Government had given them that as part of the policy of conciliation. Then, too, hon. Members had the substance in Limerick, where Jews were not allowed——

* MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is now addressing himself to matters which are not affected by the Motion before the House.

MR. WILLIAM MOORE said he had no desire to go beyond the Motion, but he understood that hon. Members opposite had been permitted to discuss the administration of the law in Plymouth and other places.

* MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is not referring to the administration of the law at all, but to various appointments.

MR. WILLIAM MOORE hoped he would be allowed to refer to the administration of the law in Limerick. The Jew in Limerick was not allowed to trade.

* MR. SPEAKER: I do not think this matter is relevant to the Motion.

MR. WILLIAM MOORE said he had other topics, but in deference to Mr. Speaker's ruling he should not refer to the £50,000 that Waterford had got for its bridge, or to the ——

* MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is quite capable of understanding what I referred to. I hope he will observe my ruling.

MR. WILLIAM MOORE said he would undertake not to trespass again, but, in view of the topics he desired to refer to, he could quite understand how the ruling was received with appreciation by hon. Members opposite.

* MR. SPEAKER: That is not a proper observation.

MR. WILLIAM MOORE disclaimed any intention of saying anything disrespectful to the Chair. He would apologise at once; he was exceedingly sorry he should have said anything of the kind and would at once withdraw the remark. Passing from the forbidden topics, he expressed the hope that the Government would not accede to the Motion. These were days in which it was impossible for an Ulster Unionist to foretell what the Government would do in response to a demand from the other side of the House, but he hoped that at any rate this demand would be resisted. It was true that agrarian crime, certainly of the most serious kind, had almost disappeared in Ireland. That improvement was largely due to the fixity of tenure clause in the Land Act of 1881. Moreover, intimidation and boycotting were stopped in twenty-four hours all over Ireland, not by the Crimes Act, but by the verdict of the jury in the Tallow case, which showed that it was possible for a trader who was injured by a combination of village tyrants to make them amenable in damages. It was quite possible that there might be a recrudescence of crime in Ireland, and the Government should not throw away the power they now possessed of dealing with special circumstances. The Liberal Party when in power were afraid to repeal the Act, and they would be afraid to do so tomorrow; he hoped the present Government also would hesitate to lay down a weapon which was forged [Cries of "By Piggott"] by Parliament before the policy of concilating enemies and estranging friends was adopted in Ireland.

MR. JOSEPH DEVLIN (Kilkenny, N.) said the anger of the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down was excusable. There was no anger like the anger of a discredited place-hunter. [MINISTERIAL cries of "Withdraw."] The Nationalist Members protested against an iniquitous measure of coercion being permanently inflicted upon the people of Ireland, and they appealed to the House to accept this Motion because it would create a true spirit of equality in the administration of the law. The hon. Member opposite had given them a beautiful lecture on boycotting, but he himself had impeached the hon. Member for South Belfast and was bringing him before an illegal tribunal. What was the cardinal crime committed by the hon. Member for South Belfast? His crime was that he had been caught discussing temperance with his hon. friend the Member for South Tyrone. In the course of his lecture on boycotting the hon. Member opposite had attacked the hon. Member for South Tyrone because he was found talking to an hon. Member on the Irish Benches. Those were the tolerant Gentlemen who came to the House of Commons and lectured Nationalist Members as to their duty and gave them lessons in etiquette and respectability, and yet the hon. Member opposite could not stand up in the House without giving an exhibition of that spirit of intolerance which animated all the acts of Irish Members belonging to the Party opposite in Ireland, and which had made life in Ulster impossible for the minority there, and had caused a good deal of criminality in the Province of Ulster. In all the stormy times which had come and gone in Ireland, who ever heard of an Irish crowd breaking the windows at the house of a Protestant minister, and yet hundreds of the followers of the hon. Member for Antrin marched into the towns breaking the windows at the residences of Catholic priests and making life unbearable for Catholic citizens, thus creating an intolerable condition of things, and all this because a number of young fellows engaged in a game of hurling on Sunday, just as the Prime Minister would engage in a game of golf. And for this inoffensive citizens had their lives made intolerable, but the Chief Secretary never proposed to put the Coercion Act into force in such places. He protested against the insolence of a little knot of irreconcilable bigots controlling the Government of Ireland. Those Gentlemen had enjoyed all the power and substance, and he protested against them having the ruling power and riveting chains on the rest of Ireland. Unionists in the North of Ireland could run riot as they pleased; there was no coercion for them. And yet they talked about equality in the administration of the law in Ireland. The representatives of the Irish people called upon the Chief Secretary, who had come fresh from Ireland and from attendance upon the King, to give some proof of that better spirit towards Ireland of which so much had been heard lately, and to repeal an Act which put the stamp of criminality on Irishmen.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON said a speech was made in the House of Commons the other day by the hon. Member for East Clare in which he made a remark with a great deal of sense in it. He said that when the hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh got up to speak upon the Crimes Act, he knew very well what he was going to say from long experience. He pleaded guilty to that, but what he did say was that it was not his fault, but the fault of hon. Gentlemen opposite who would not leave the Crimes Act alone, but continued raising the question by Motions of the kind before the House. What was the history of the Crimes Act? Why was it introduced and why had it become the law of the land? It was not passed under a Conservative or a Unionist Government, but at a time when a Liberal Government was in power, and when the Nationalist Members stated publicly, and carried out to the full their statement, that their plan of campaign in Ireland was to make government impossible under the common law, and to make the proceedings in the House of Commons under its ordinary rules ineffective. Of course when that became clear to the Government presided over by Mr. Gladstone it was decided that the resources of civilisation had not been quite exhausted and the Crimes Act was introduced. The hon. Member who introduced this Motion said that Mr. Gladstone's speeches ought to be remembered, and he quite agreed with that remark. Mr. Gladstone said that "crime dogged the footsteps of the Land League," and that was why he brought in the Crimes Act in 1882. In 1881 there had been 4,439 agrarian crimes in Ireland, but the very next year after the passing of the Crimes Act such crimes dropped to 870, and the year after to 762. It was a descending curve. That temporary Act lapsed in 1885—[NATIONALIST cheers]—he did not know why hon. Gentlemen cheered; did they cheer crime rising or falling? In 1886 agrarian crime at once rose to 1,056. Then came the Unionist Government, who in 1887 brought in the Crimes Act which was still in force, and down went these crimes to 660, and gradually declined until, in 1903, they had fallen to 195. Hon. Gentlemen had cited a case of riot in Ulster, but he held that any breaking of the law, whether by

Protestant or Roman Catholic, should be punished. Who complained of the law? Certainly not the minority of some 1,500,000, a part of which he represented. He did not feel aggrieved because the law prevented him from intimidating his neighbour, from assaulting a sheriff or policeman, or from inciting people to acts of boycotting. The position in Ireland was not such as to warrant the Government in doing away with the Peace Preservation Act. Hon. Gentlemen opposite had given indications that the resources of their policy were by no means exhausted. The hon. Member for Waterford recently stated that Home Rule was once more becoming the deciding factor in English elections, declared that the United Irish League was as united and powerful an organisation as Ireland had had in its service, and appealed to the League to make ready for the approaching general election.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): Absolutely appalling words.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON asked what was the Crimes Act passed for? It was originally passed because hon. Gentlemen opposite and their friends and predecessors stated that unless they got Home Rule they would make law impossible in Ireland and government impossible in the House of Commons under ordinary rules. It was then a question of Home Rule, and so the Crimes Act was introduced by Mr. Gladstone under those circumstances. The Nationalist Party had since shown no sign of mollifying the asperity of their policy. They had over and over again openly declared themselves to be enemies of the Empire. Now they had an organisation which the hon. Member for Waterford said was in the most perfect condition of discipline and ready at any moment, whenever they got the opportunity, to carry out his will and the will of the Party he led. Would it be safe then to remove this obstacle which had been fatal to the progress of his policy? Changes had taken place undoubtedly in this matter. The hon. Member for South Tyrone held views quite recently very similar to his own. He did not know whether the hon. Member had changed his opinion, and whether he was going to support the Motion now before the House. Speaking in this House in 1895 the hon. Member said that if an outbreak of crime occurred again in Ireland and this Act were repealed outrageous criminals must escape, or the House must spend many months in passing another Act. The hon. Member also taunted the Government for neglecting to secure fair trial by using their powers for change of venue. What the hon. Member did in 1895 was not very ancient history. In the course of his speech on that occasion he said he had more sympathy with the victims of outrages than with the scoundrels who perpetrated them. [A NATIONALIST MEMBER: "Sheridan."] The only argument in favour of the Motion was that Ireland was in a state of profound peace. That was a solid argument, but the question which troubled his mind was what was likely to happen in the future. There was going to be a change of Government if hon. Members opposite and the Irish Party should realise their aspirations. The House of Commons spent three months in getting the Crimes Act through, believing that it was not a coercive but a protective measure. The hon. Member for South Tyrone had said that all the proclamations under the Act had been revoked, that at the present moment the Act was absolutely innocuous, but that it was wise to keep the sword in the sheath, to be brought out if required. Those words he heartily re-echoed. The Crimes Act existed at the present moment but it interfered with no one who did not commit crime. There was peace in Ireland, but the hon. and learned Member for Waterford had adumbrated the possibility in the future of a recrudescence of those scenes which had taken place in Ireland, and when the desire to throw off the yoke of this country would bring organisations such as the Land League again into existence. It would not be sensible to repeal an Act which had only interfered with those who had claimed the right to persecute and injure their fellow-countrymen, and which had brought to Ireland immunity from crimes that had disgraced her past history. He did not believe the House of Commons would do anything of the kind. He and his friends absolutely denied the bigotry which was ascribed to them by hon. Members opposite. They believed that the Nationalists desired the welfare of the country just as they did, but they pursued it by different roads and different methods. He and his friends believed that if the policy pursued by hon. Gentlemen opposite ever attained its end it would lead to the disruption of the Empire and the ruin of Ireland.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs) felt he ought to apologise for intervening in a debate which had been so warmly Irish, but perhaps it might be expected that he should say something in behalf of those who usually acted with him on that Bench. Not that the something was really required, because they had again and again voted for Motions similar to that before the House, and they would continue to support any similar Motion until the repeal was accomplished of the Act at which the Motion was aimed. They were in a camp totally opposed to those who desired legislation of a coercive character. The hon. Member for Antrim said the Liberal Government from 1892 to 1895 did not venture to repeal the Crimes Act. It did better from its own point of view, for its hands were pretty full, and to repeal an Act of that sort against the strenuous opposition of the hon. Gentleman's friends would have occupied considerable time. That Government governed Ireland without using the Crimes Act, and thus showed that Ireland could be kept quiet by the application of the ordinary law if the people knew that the administration of the law was in reasonable and friendly hands. They had for some time come to see that coercive measures of this sort, that the whole policy of coercion, stood on a radically unsound basis. What you had got to do in a country which was liable to disturbance, such as Ireland in her history had undoubtedly shown herself to be, was to gain the confidence of the masses of the people in the administration of justice. It was not by making the law more drastic, by the adoption of exceptional measures and eccentric methods of administration, that confidence could be gained, but by making the provisions of the law and its administration as even, as regular, as open, as fair, as generous as possible. It was by these means the sympathy and support of the masses of the population in administration of the law would be secured. That should be the object in view.

On Friday last, in the course of a discussion upon a very reasonable proposal to do away with a flagrant injustice, as it was thought to be, in the administration of the law in Ireland, the Attorney-General for Ireland quoted a nineteen-year-old speech of his delivered in Scotland. The right hon. and learned Gentleman must have very little to do, or a very singular taste, if he spent his leisure in reading those old speeches, his own or, with few exceptions, anybody else's. But he dug up this old speech in which he had spoken of the difficulty of obtaining verdicts in Irish trials and suggested that if a reasonable alteration of the law were made permanent the greater part of the difficulties would disappear. He was not then recommending anything exceptional or eccentric; he was recommending an extension to Ireland, as he would to England, of a simple principle of law in Scotland, that juries should return verdicts by a majority. He would not argue that question or refer to it except for the purpose of showing that he was not recommending anything he was not willing himself to undergo, for his country had lived and flourished under that law for many generations. The application of a coercive law was another matter altogether. What was it that they had in Ireland that was really the root of the whole mischief? It was that for generations there had been two political Parties contending with each other. There had been the Government and its Ministers and the officials of the law trying by any means they could to obtain verdicts, and naturally, in opposition to them, there had been a quick-witted, sensitive, and determined people trying any cunning device that they could adopt to thwart the officials of the law in their method. Which of those two contending parties was to blame? It was the administrators and the officials of the law, who had created, through many generations, this atmosphere of suspicion, and who had alienated the sympathy of a great mass of the people from the side of the law. That he believed to be the key to the question, the root of the whole mischief, and what they ought to do was to assist in removing it. Therefore it was that he said it would be wise to take the step of throwing themselves on the ordinary law, dismissing the idea that they could ultimately do anything but mischief and bring anything but disaster by the adoption and enforcement of a drastic exceptional law. And then they would, by showing the people that they could trust the administration of justice as being impartial and fairly controlled, gradually gain that which ought to be their object, the sympathy of the people all round.

The right hon. Gentleman who had just sat down had referred to a matter which was rather beyond their scope that night—namely, the question of the self-government of Ireland. That, of course, was the remedy which they would apply. [MINISTERIAL cries of "When?" "Asquith," and "Rosebery."] The path to it had been greatly facilitated by the action, not of His Majesty's Government, but of the different forms of it of which the present Government was the residuum; at all events, by the Party opposite. They had given to the mass of the Irish people the control of their local government. He did not forget what Lord Salisbury said, and said with great truth—that it would be much more dangerous to give to the mass of the people the control of their local government than the control of their larger national concerns, because they were then dealing with ordinary, small matters indeed, but which intimately affected their daily life and were the subject of jealousy and prejudice, and which would be conducted without the strong and bright light of general public opinion. That was an opinion with which he agreed. The Party opposite having done that went further, and, whereas the most of these difficulties arose in the agrarian question, from the antagonism of landlord and tenant, they had now practically proceeded to obliterate the landlord from the face of the country. He made no complaint. So far from that, he congratulated the Party opposite on both those steps. He admired them for having courage to take them, although his admiration was coupled with a chuckle. He would say to them that, having gone three-fourths of the way, they had better go the other part of the way, or, at all events, prepare themselves for it. Let them advance in the direction of increasing confidence in the people and thereby obtain the confidence of the people. To do so he believed one of the first steps would be to dispense with this exceptional legislation. Let them have the courage to put away this musty, obsolete weapon—a weapon which was useless and dangerous for him who wielded it, cruel and exasperating to those upon whom it was employed, and the cause of infinite delay and disappointment to the hope of a contented and friendly Ireland.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover) said the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition began by stating that he felt he owed some apology for intervening in what had been an exclusively Irish debate. Although it was obviously his duty to say what was the attitude the Government should take up, he felt that he owed almost an apology if he was to make a long speech to-night. The duel had been spirited but good-humoured, and no one who was not an Irishman and conversant with the amount of spirit which could be put into such a subject would believe that it could be carried on without the infliction of a deadly wound. It generally fell to the lot of the Chief Secretary to receive blows from both sides. The Leader of the Opposition had gone on to say that those with whom he usually acted had voted again and again for the repeal of the Crimes Act. It was quite true that the Leader of the Opposition voted for the repeal of the Crimes Act. His Party was then in power, but he took no more effective steps. And now to-night he was prepared to vote not for a Bill but for a Motion. He invited the attention of the House to the Motion which the Leader of the Opposition had suggested for their attention. Although he should speak without warrant, he should argue that they did not consider this a very important question; he ventured to say that they did not consider it very urgent. It was quite true that in 1894–5, when the Irish Party introduced a Bill to repeal the Crimes Act, the Leader of the Opposition supported the Bill in all its stages. His Party was then in power, and he took no more effective steps, and now to-night he was prepared to vote, not for a Bill, but for a Motion. He invited the attention of the House to the contrast to which the Leader of the Opposition had invited their notice. He thought that this was the first occasion on which it was suggested that the Act should be withdrawn from the Statute-book. [Cries of "Oh" from the IRISH Benches.]

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Surely the right hon. Gentleman does not seriously mean to say that?

MR. WYNDHAM: Yes, I do.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: We have had debates for hours initiated session after session against the maintenance of the Act?

MR. WYNDHAM: I have been Chief Secretary for three-and-a-half years, and never during that period has a Motion been brought forward for the repeal of the Act. This year the hon. Members had been exceptionally fortunate in the ballot, and this was the eighth occasion on which it had been their privilege to invite the attention of the House to Irish questions. Not until that night had they brought the subject forward.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Surely the right hon. Gentlemen has an unpleasant reason for remembering that not only the reduction of his salary was moved on the question, but that for an hour I denounced the right hon. Gentleman as the head of a coercionist Government, and asked him to repeal the Act.

MR. WYNDHAM said he had been criticised for having put the Crimes Act into force, and there had been debates on the administration of the Act, on Irish railways, on technical instruction, on the land question, and many other Irish subjects, but this was the first time in five years they were asked to repeal the statute passed in 1887. The Leader of the Opposition went on to point out that he was in a camp totally opposed to those who admired coercive legislation; and begged the question by inviting him to give an epitome of all the speeches made night after night in which the then Government declared that the Bill was not coercive; that it differed little, if at all, from the legal procedure in Scotland. He would remind the right hon. Gentleman of the action taken by the Party which he now led. He did not want to go back on the past. He was glad that the present position offered many points of difference from the past. If the right hon. Gentleman at one time desired only that juries in Ireland should return their verdicts by a majority, he did not go as far as some of those with whom he was associated in those days. This was a matter of some notoriety. The Government of which the right hon. Gentleman was a member in the year 1886, at a time of excitement, contemplated an Act which, according to the description of Sir George Trevelyan, would have differed little, if at all, from the Act of 1887. Sir George Trevelyan, speaking at Galashiels in May, 1886, as to the intention of his Government had it remained in office to have introduced a measure similar to the Crimes Act of 1887, said—

> "In June last, Mr. Gladstone and his Cabinet determined to maintain the law in Ireland. They resolved to have a preliminary investigation on oath into undetected crime, which you have in Scotland. They resolved to have power of changing the scene of a trial from a locality where public feeling was too strong for that trial to be a fair one—a power which you have in Scotland. They resolved to call a special jury in cases of crime as a substitute for the far more potent and effective system of committing or acquitting by a majority of jurors—which you have in Scotland. They resolved to allow a summary sentence of a few months to be inflicted for crimes of violence and intimidation by two stipendiary magistrates, who answered in essential respects to your Scotch sheriffs."

If he were speaking at any length he could make it evident to any one that, so far as Sections 3 and 4 of the Crimes Act were concerned, which provided for the change of venue and for special juries, those sections did not go further than the existing law in Scotland. In Scotland, as with the Chief Secretary in Ireland, the institution of prosecutions rested with the Lord Advocate, or, in other words, with the Government. He agreed that the procedure under the Crimes Act was different from the procedure in England, but it was not different from the procedure in Scotland, and he had yet to learn that it was one of the aims of a Chief Secretary to effect absolute similarity between the laws in England and Ireland. The right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition had expounded the doctrine that a quick-witted and sensitive people might be expected to return a verdict not in accordance with the evidence, because they differed upon constitutional questions from the Government who instituted the prosecution.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: What I said, or intended to say, was that when they find themselves treated by devices of cunning and tricks, such as the wholesale exclusion of jurors, and in many cases the change of venue, and other devices resorted to for the purpose of obtaining convictions—it is only in accordance with human nature that they should retort by devices of their own to which I alluded.

MR. WYNDHAM said he thought the right hon. Gentleman had not mended his case. They were discussing the advisability of the repeal of the Crimes Act. Under that Act, by a perfectly legitimate operation copied from the procedure in Scotland, they attempted to anticipate that local feeling which put too great a strain on the conscience of the jurors by changing the venue and obtaining a special jury. That was a much more straightforward practice than asking a great number of jurors to stand aside. He joined with Lord Spencer, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Montrose, and all his predecessors, on whatever side of the House they sat and whatever view they held upon the constitutional relations of the two countries, in repudiating any suggeston that the Government of Ireland pressed for verdicts unduly, or unless they believed that it was necessary to do so. In spite of the view which the right hon. Gentleman held, during the three years in which he held office he did not think it expedient to devote the time of the House to the repeal of this statute, because it would waste time, rouse angry passions, and do no good to Ireland. That was his view. He believed that the legislation they had initiated for Ireland was likely to do good to Ireland, and that the repeal of this Act would do harm—at any rate, would arouse angry passions which, thank goodness, had been laid to rest.

He was told that he was a member of a residual Government, but the residual Government might remain in office longer than a potential conglomerate Opposition imagined. They had a consistent policy in this matter. In reply to the right hon. Gentleman, he hoped he had, very hastily, sketched his reason for holding still that this Act was no violation of the Constitution. It was different in some particulars from the procedure which prevailed in this country; it was not widely dissimilar from the procedure which prevailed in Scotland. The hon. Member who introduced the Motion, in an able and eloquent speech, could not recall whether there were any proclamations in force under the Crimes Act. There were some, under Sections 3 and 4. There had been four cases only of a somewhat serious character. Trials had been held, and in three cases convictions were obtained. One of those cases took place in July last year, and he was told then that the Constitution was being violated because these persons were made amenable to the law in a place where a trial could be held without placing an undue stress upon the conscience of those in whose midst they lived. But that was a case of following in Ireland the procedure which obtained in Scotland. He agreed with his hon. and gallant friend the Member for North Armagh in this—that he had not sought the occasion for this debate; he agreed, too, that, the occasion being offered, it was very hard to speak without making the kind of speech which was made in old days. He differed, however, from his hon. and gallant friend in feeling, as he did, that there was quite a different ring in the speeches made during the present debate. There were in Ireland some two, three, or four places where some embers of past disturbance still glowed. It would be a heavy responsibility for any Government to say that all chance of those embers being fanned into flames had passed away. He would not name those places; he did not wish to advertise them; he knew that those who kept the embers of discord still glowing were acting without any support from any organisation in

Ireland, and that all those who wished the Land Act to continue its pacifying influence regretted that such discord should still prevail, insensate as it was and opposed to the hopes they all shared. On the horizon of social life in Ireland he saw no single fact which could justify him in declaring that he anticipated a recrudescence of social disorder in that country; but there was always something beyond the horizon; and he must be rash indeed if, with the bitter experience and sad disappointment of decades behind him he said that never at any time would a storm cloud sweep up again over that horizon and overshadow for a time the fair prospects they were now privileged to view. For those reasons the Government did not intend to repeal the Crimes Act in Ireland.

Mr. DELANY: Why did you not say that the other day in Dublin?

Mr. WYNDHAM said he could not follow the interruption of the hon. Member. Although much had happened upon which they might congratulate themselves, he must say that the position of the Government now was exactly the position stated by the Prime Minister when he was Leader of the Opposition in 1895. His right hon. friend then said—

> "The Crimes Act is not now in operation; long may that happy state of things continue; may Government after Government succeed each other in this country, and the tranquil course of Irish society go on as now. May the existence of the Crimes Act on the Statute-book be forgotten; but with the bitter experience of the past we should be criminally foolish if we refused to keep in repair the only instrument by which a state of disturbance can be dealt with."

If that were not, as it was, the definite view of the Government, and if it were right because of certain conditions to accede to this Motion, would they be fostering the state of peace which existed in Ireland? He thought not. There were people living in Ireland who remembered days in which their liberty was interfered with, and who, in some cases, suffered personal loss. There were many other persons who sympathised with them and considered themselves bound to espouse their cause; and if the Government were to announce that they intended to repeal the Crimes Act, that would not be accepted as testimony from them that times were better in Ireland. It would be taken as a declaration of a great change of policy, and that the Government held themselves absolved from a responsibility of which they could not divest themselves. Acting with a due sense of that responsibility he said that, not only would they be wrong in repealing the Crimes Act, but that if they did so the general sense of confidence which now existed in Ireland would be replaced by a general sense of timidity, and the realisation of the fair prospect now in view, which could only be attained for the good of Ireland by a steady progress, as laid down by the Land Conference, would be adjourned to another day. That was why, on the part of the Government, he refused to accept this spasmodic Motion.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND said the right hon. Gentleman was quite right in saying that he observed a change in the character of this debate as contrasted with previous debates. The change was, he thought, largely to be found in the fact that the Nationalist Members were able to regard with more equanimity than in the past the exhibitions from parts of the House opposite such as they had had that night. He did not observe any change in the tone of the right hon. Gentleman. It was perfectly evident to him before the hon. Member for Antrim had been speaking five minutes that his object was, going as near to insult as the forms of the House permitted, to goad the Nationalist Members into some action which would precipitate a scene. He thought his colleagues and himself might congratulate themselves that they had foiled that plan by showing that even under provocation of that kind they could preserve an equanimity and calmness which must have conveyed to the House the utter indifference and contempt with which that attempt had been met. The right hon. Gentleman was ludicrously wrong if he saw in that any indication that they did not regard this question as a vitally urgent one. He was rather surprised that the Chief Secretary made the petty point that a Motion of this kind had not been moved for two years, and that no Bill had been introduced on the subject. He himself was very doubtful whether it was wise to give notice of this Motion. The question at issue was so far-reaching, grave, and urgent that he had serious doubts whether it could be adequately discussed in a three hours sitting, and whether they would not be minimising the importance and urgency of the question by bringing in a futile Bill on a Friday. But the Nationalist Members had shown their view of the urgency of this question in the past by impeaching the conduct of the Government by attacking the salary of the Minister in charge; and on a Motion for the reduction of that salary founding an impeachment of his conduct in his office.

Let him say, and in this respect he spoke the views of his colleagues, that he had listened with great gratification to the speech of the Leader of the Opposition. So far as that right hon. Gentleman was concerned, he never had any doubt of his view on this matter. He was glad, however, the right hon. Gentleman had expressed his view to-night frankly, and perhaps he might go further and say with what gratification he heard his further reference to self-government in Ireland. What a petty reproach it was for the Chief Secretary to make against the Leader of the Opposition that when in office he did not introduce a Bill to repeal the Coercion Act. Of course he did not. He introduced a Home Rule Bill, which would, of course, have swept away the whole of this rotten edifice and misgovernment in Ireland. The terms the right hon. Gentleman had used with reference to self-government in Ireland, would give satisfaction to all those who recognised in him a friend of the national aspirations of the Irish people. What was the defence of the Chief Secretary? It was that the Coercion Act was proposed because of an alleged state of crime and disorder in Ireland. Crime and disorder admittedly did not now exist in Ireland and had not existed for a long time. It was said that the Coercion Act was necessary in 1887 because of crime and disorder, and that it was necessary to retain it because crime and disorder might return in the future. According to that theory this was in truth and reality to be a perpetual Coercion Act. The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary seemed to desire to mislead the House—he did not use the phrase in any offensive sense—as to what this Coercion Act really was. An intelligent foreigner listening to the right hon. Gentleman would say what an unreasonable people the Irish were to make all this trouble about a Coercion Act which was merely a change of procedure in the law in Ireland approximating to the procedure in the law in Scotland. What a dishonest, he almost said what a ludicrous, perversion of the true facts of the case.

What was the essential point in this Coercion Act? It was that it abrogated all over Ireland at the will of a single man the most cherished possession of the people of this country—the right of trial by jury. By the Union England deprived Ireland of her own Constitution, and she never gave Ireland the English Constitution in return. Bitter opponent as he was of English rule in Ireland, he did not hesitate to say that the British Constitution was one of the freest Constitutions in the world; and if that Constitution were in force in Ireland things in Ireland would be different; but never for one hour since the Union had Ireland had the advantage of being under the British Constitution. Every year since the Union a Coercion Act of one kind or another had been in existence which deprived Ireland of one or other of the bulwarks of the British Constitution. He regarded the Coercion Act as a permanent disability and stigma on the Irish people. He took the gravest possible view of the present Coercion Act, which had been placed as a permanent disability on the necks of the Irish people. He had no hesitation in declaring, with brutal frankness, that a law which deprived the Irish people of the right of trial by jury was a law which justified armed rebellion; and he said further that if the Irish people had the means of rebellion against the existence of that law it would be their duty to rebel. That was the view which was universally held by the Irish people. It was said the Irish people were disloyal. Give them something to be loyal for; give them the British Constitution. If he were an Englishman living under the free Constitution of England, he would be ready to die for that Constitution. But so long as Ireland was denied the rights and privileges of the British Constitution the

Government of Ireland would not deserve and would not receive the loyalty of the people of Ireland.

He knew not what the future might have in store for them. He would welcome most eagerly the day when all serious enmity between Ireland and England disappeared. He believed honestly they were on the road towards that consummation, because with the exception of the speech of the Chief Secretary all the speeches in favour of the Coercion Act had come from that little ring of anti-Irish Irishmen who, in the words of John Bright, stood in the way of the franchise and every other right conceded to the Irish people, and had always sacrificed the rights of their country in order to maintain their own ascendancy. It was a sign of the times that the English Members had remained silent, although of course they would vote down the Motion. He thought they were advancing rapidly to the time when enmity would disappear between the countries. Local government had been given to Ireland, and the Irish people were governing themselves as wisely and well in local affairs as were the English people. The House had also passed a great Land Act: the ultimate result would be, in spite of delay and drawbacks, to abolish landlordism, which had been the cause of almost all —a great portion at any rate—of the social trouble in Ireland, and which was the greatest barrier which stood between the masses of the people and the so-called gentry of the country. The effect of such legislation undoubtedly would be that before long Englishmen would see that the wisest and safest course for them to adopt would be to trust the Irish people in large things just as they had trusted them successfully in small, and that what had changed Canada from being a country in open rebellion into a contented portion of the Empire probably would have the same effect in Ireland. But so long as this Coercion Act remained in existence, so long as every free-born Irishman felt that his dearest liberties might be taken away to-morrow at the scratch of a pen by an individual sent over to Ireland, so long England could not expect and would not receive the loyalty of the Irish people. He wished he had words at his command to express more adequately than he had been able his sense of the importance of this question from the Irish point of view. It was not too much to say that they regarded the existence of this Coercion Act as a deprivation of their liberties and a gross insult to the whole character of their people; and as long as it was there, good-bye to the hope of better relations between England and Ireland.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.) said that some of the Ulster Members wished to know what he was going to do, and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for North Armagh read an extract from a speech of his delivered ten years ago. He did not disavow that speech, but to hear his Ulster colleagues speak one would imagine that nothing had taken place since the year 1887. He saw them coming down to that House and forming a solid row when anything for the coercion of Ireland was being proposed, but he looked for them in vain when measures of appeasement and reform for Ireland were being discussed. That was a most hateful condition of affairs. Did anyone imagine that the Local Government Act could be passed without producing the present inevitable result? It had brought men together to discuss public affairs who never met in any capacity except to quarrel with each other. Agrarian crime—the only class of crime in the country, had absolutely disappeared. And of what had happened during the past week, surely he who ran might read. The King had had a triumphant progress in the South of Ireland in the most Nationalist centres. His Majesty had been received with perfect respect and perfect good feeling. [AN HON. MEMBER: Why not?] He remembered the time when it was not so. Surely he must be a dull student who did not know what happened years ago in this respect. All this showed that the persistent action of that House in welldoing had begun to tell upon the Irish people, and he believed that if they went on extending these things, turning neither to the right nor to the left from the path of strict duty, it would bring its reward, and that they would yet see a contented Irish people. It was true that there were some dark spots in Ireland, and the cause of them was known. But for those spots the difficulty would be entirely over. He laid on the Irish landlords the blame of keeping alive this agitation and bad feeling in the midst of an attempted solution. The only real defence offered by the Chief Secretary was that there were those spots in which a recrudescence of crime might recur if the landlords did not accept the good offer of money made them for the land. He himself was down on the system of keeping Irishmen apart, and setting them at one another's throat. He would be no party to it. There was a feeling growing up in Ireland that the interests of the country were greater than the interests of the landlords, and men were beginning to see things as they were. Two years ago, when the Coercion Act was discussed, he went out of the House without voting. He wished to be perfectly frank with the House. He desired to co-operate with the Irish Members in everything that was for the well-being of Ireland, and if he could get rid of those spots he should have no difficulty about the course he would take. He believed that the Land Act would be successful, but as long as those spots existed in Ireland where crime might be produced by the action of the landlords he was not prepared to take the remedy out of the hands of the Government. He hoped, however, that the day was not far distant when all coercive legislation would be removed from the Statute-book because it was unnecessary.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 124; Noes, 197. (Division List No. 114.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ambrose, Robert
Asher, Alexander
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bell, Richard
Black, Alexander William
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burke, E. Haviland-
Caldwell, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Crean, Eugene
Cullinan, J.
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Evans, Sir F. H. (Maidstone)
Farrell, James Patrick
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Ffrench, Peter
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Gilhooly, James
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herb. John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Griffith, Ellis J.
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Lewis V.(Rossendale
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kilbride, Denis
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.
Leamy, Edmund
Leese, Sir Jos. F. (Accrington)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Fadden, Edward
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mooney, John J.
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nolan, Col. J. P. (Galway, N.)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Jas. (Roscommon, N.)
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rea, Russell
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Rickett, J. Compton
Robson, William Snowdon
Roche, John
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Spencer, Rt.Hn.C.R(Northants
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, D. Alfred (Merthyr)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Young, Samuel

Tellers for the Ayes—Sir Thomas Esmonde and Captain Donelan.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Allhusen, Augustus H. Eden
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Mich. Hicks
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Campbell, J. H. M. (Dublin Univ
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. A (Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Rt. Hn. Sir John C. R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley-
Davies, Sir H. D. (Chatham)
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Dorington, Rt. Hn. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Forster, Henry William
Foster, P. S. (Warwick, S.W.)
Fyler, John Arthur
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Gore, Hn. G. R. C. Ormsby-(Salop
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Green, Walford D. (Wednesbury
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Hamilton, Marq of (L'nd'nderry
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th)
Harris, Dr. Fredk. R. (Dulwich
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur H. (Hanley)
Heath, James (Staffords., N.W.
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hobhouse, Rt Hn. H (Somers't, E
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hunt, Rowland
Hutton, John (Yorks., N.R.)
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, J. Grant (Yorks., N.R.
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Rt. Hon. W. (Bristol, S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Calmont, Colonel James
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh, W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell, Rt. Hn. Sir H. E (Wigt'n
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriesshire)
Middlemore, Jn. Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Moore, William
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Morpeth, Viscount
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parkes, Ebenezer
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Reid, James (Greenock)
Renwick, George
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sandys, Lt.-Col. Thos. Myles
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. Edw. J
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. H. (Sheff'ld
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Webb, Colonel William George
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

Adjourned at thirteen minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Thursday, 5th May, 1904.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with:—Baker Street and Waterloo Railway. The same was ordered to lie on the Table.

Standing Orders Committee. Report from, That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the City of London (Central Criminal Court House) Bill ought to be dispensed with. Read, and agreed to.

Metropolitan District Railway Bill [H.L.]. The King's consent signified; and Bill reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

Great Yarmouth Corporation Bill [H.L.]. The King's consent signified; and Bill reported, with Amendments.

Preston Corporation Water Bill [H.L.]; Whitby Gas Bill; Bournemouth Corporation (Tramways) Bill [H.L.]; Leicestershire and Warwickshire Electric Power Bill [H.L.]; Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Electric Power Bill [H.L.]; Cardiff Railway Bill [H.L.]. Reported, with Amendments.

Ryde Gas Bill. Reported, with an Amendment.

Newcastle and Gateshead Water Bill [H.L.]. Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

Alexandra (Newport and South Wales) Docks and Railway Bill [H.L.]. Report from the Select Committee, That the Bill on being reported should be referred to the Chairman of Committees in order that certain proofs and consents may be given in respect thereof; read, and agreed to. Bill reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments, and re-committed.

Clyde Valley Electrical Power Bill [H.L.]. Read 3ª, and passed, and sent to the Commons.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

Wellington (Somerset) Gas Bill. Read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

Barnet District Gas and Water Bill; Donegal Railway Bill. Brought from the Commons; read 1ª; and referred to the Examiners.

Victoria University of Manchester Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to.

Hutchesons' Hospital and Hutchesons' Educational Trust Bill [H.L.]; South Shields Gas Bill; Chippenham Gas Bill; Sheppy Gas Bill; North Staffordshire Railway Bill; London, Tilbury, and Southend Railway Bill. Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Lord Aberdare be proposed to the House as a member of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Earl of Lathom; read, and agreed to.

Metropolitan Common Scheme (Hillingdon East) Provisional Order Bill; Metropolitan Common Scheme (Farnborough) Provisional Order Bill. Read 2ª (according to order), and committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

PETITIONS.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES (METRIC SYSTEM) BILL [H.L.].

Petitions in favour of; of West Ham Corporation; Edinburgh Parish Council; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

JOURNAL COMMITTEE.

Report from, That the One hundred and thirty-fifth Volume of the Journals (3rd Edward VII., 1903), with an Index, was ready for delivery; read, and ordered to lie on the Table; and the said Volume ordered to be delivered in the same manner as the preceding Volumes of the Journals have been delivered.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

No. 3151. China (Hankow).

No. 3152. Spain (Bilbao).

ANKYLOSTOMIASIS.

Report to the Secretary of State for the Home Department, by A. E. Baycott, Esq., M.B., B.Sc., on the diagnosis of ankylostoma infection, with special reference to the examination of the blood.

MOTOR CARS.

Report of the Departmental Committee appointed by the President of the Local Government Board to inquire with regard to regulations for the purposes of Section 12 of the Motor Car Act, 1903, together with Minutes of Evidence taken before the Committee.

Part I. Report.

Part II. Minutes of Evidence, Appendix, and Index to Evidence.

RAILWAY ACCIDENTS.

Returns of accidents and casualties as reported to the Board of Trade by the several railway companies in the United Kingdom during the year ended 31 t December, 1903, in pursuance of the Regulation of Railways Act (1871); together with reports of the inspecting officers, assistant inspecting officers, and sub-inspectors of the Railway Department to the Board of Trade upon certain accidents which were inquired into. Part II. Reports on Accidents.

FISHERIES (SCOTLAND).

Twenty-second Annual Report of the Fishery Board for Scotland, being for the year 1903. Part I. General Report.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

SUPERANNUATION.

Treasury minute, dated 29th April, 1904, declaring that George Hadfield, fitter, marker-out, Royal Carriage Department, War Office, was appointed without a Civil Service certificate through inadvertence on the part of the head of his Department.

PUBLIC WORKS (IRELAND).

Treasury minute, dated 26th April, 1904, authorising the sale of a portion of foreshore near the old harbour of Dunleary, not required for the purposes of Kingstown Harbour.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES (METRIC SYSTEM) BILL [H.L.].

Report from the Select Committee (with the Proceedings of the Committee and Appendix) made, and to be printed. (No. 70.). Minutes of Evidence laid upon the Table and to be delivered out. Bill reported, with Amendments, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Friday the 13th instant; and to be printed as amended. (No. 71.)

SALE OF INTOXICANTS TO CHILDREN BILL [H.L.].

Read 3ª (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons.

OUTDOOR RELIEF (FRIENDLY SOCIETIES) BILL [H.L.]

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (The Earl of HALSBURY): My Lords, before the Order of the Day for the Third Reading is read, I rise to call your Lordships' attention to the fact that this Bill, which has originated in this House, is undoubtedly a breach of the privileges of the House of Commons, inasmuch as it contemplates a charge on the rates and is therefore financial in its character. If your Lordships read it a third time to-day and send it down to the other House, the fact that it is a breach of their privileges would be notified to the Commons by Mr. Speaker, and then, the question of privilege arising, the Bill would be laid aside. If, on the other hand, your Lordships rejected it because it was a breach of the privileges of the other House, it would prevent a Bill on the same subject—and I understand there are two such Bills now before the House of Commons—from being passed through your Lordships' House this session. What I would suggest to Lord Monkswell, who is in charge of the Bill, is that, in order to avoid this risk, he should either postpone its further progress until a Bill of the same character introduced in the House of Commons comes up to your Lordships, or that he should now move the adjournment of the debate on the Third Reading. By the adoption of either of these courses the risk of imperilling this Bill, for which I personally intend to vote, will be avoided.

LORD MONKSWELL: My Lords, I am much obliged to the noble and learned Earl on the Woolsack for the kindly way in which he has treated me in the matter of this Bill, and I should be very glad to take his advice if there was not, in my opinion, another method of procedure. My attention had been called to the fact that this Bill would probably—I do not say undoubtedly—be considered a breach of the privileges of the other House, and the way in which I propose to deal with it, subject, of course, to anything the noble and learned Earl on the Woolsack may say, is by the insertion of a privileged Amendment at the end of the Bill to this effect—

> "Provided that no charge is thereby imposed on the rates."

In this I am following precisely the same course that was adopted by His Majesty's Government in the matter of the Education Bill. The noble and learned Earl will no doubt remember that on that occasion a right rev. Prelate moved an Amendment to increase the grants to the voluntary schools—an Amendment which deliberately set aside the judgment of the House of Commons, which had expressed the opinion that this particular money should not go to the voluntary schools. On the question of privilege, it was a very strong thing indeed for your Lordships' House to carry an Amendment of that kind, which was known to be absolutely contrary to the vote of a large majority in the other House. What did the Government do on that occasion? The Duke of Norfolk moved an Amendment to insert at the end of the clause—

> "But this obligation on the local education authority shall throw no additional charge on any public fund."

Of course, that was not intended to be a serious Amendment. Nobody took it to be such, and Sir William Harcourt, in the House of Commons, described it as a nonsensical Amendment. But, nonsensical or not, it prevailed for its purpose, and the House of Commons not only did not regard the right rev. Prelate's Amendment as a breach of privilege, but they absolutely adopted your Lordships' view by a large majority, and passed the provision—a purely financial provision—as altered in your Lordships' House. The Amendment which was then moved by the Duke of Norfolk was not on the Paper of your Lordships' House, but was submitted at the last moment without notice. When objection was taken on that occasion by my noble friend the Leader of the Opposition on the ground that a Third Reading Amendment ought to have been on the Paper, the noble and learned Earl the Lord Chancellor said—

> "This Amendment does not really and cannot in itself affect the clause, but it allows the question to be discussed in the House of Commons."

then the noble Earl went on to say—

> "But for this Amendment, the Amendment already inserted might be rejected without discussion at all. In that way I think the Amendment of the Duke of Norfolk does not come within the ordinary rule about Third Reading Amendments, because it is one of those which we almost always put in at the end of every Bill when the question of finance arises."

If His Majesty's Government should come to the conclusion that they were wrong in supporting the Duke of Norfolk's Amendment, and that in point of fact we did commit a breach of the privileges of the House of Commons, I should not demur to the view of the Government, and if they consider that the difficulty which the Lord Chancellor has suggested stands in the way of this Bill cannot be cured by a privileged Amendment, then I shall no doubt think it best, in the interests of the Bill, to withdraw it or adjourn the debate.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: I would point out to the noble Lord that the two cases are entirely different. This Bill deals with rates which have been voted for one definite purpose, and if you were to strike out that which deals with rates you would strike out the whole Bill.

EARL SPENCER: My Lords, I do not wish to enter at any length into this argument, which is an extremely difficult one, but I would venture to point out that we really have nothing at this moment before the House. I should suggest that when the Third Reading is called on, my noble friend should move the adjournment of the debate. We could then consider more fully the whole position.

Order of the Day for the Third Reading read.

Lord MONKSWELL: I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Moved, That the debate stand adjourned.—(*Lord Monkswell.*)

On Question, Motion agreed to.

OPEN SPACES BILL [H.L.]

[Second Reading.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

The PRESIDENT of the BOARD of AGRICULTURE and FISHERIES (The Earl of Onslow): My Lords, although this is a bulky Bill, it is really a measure only of consolidation and to secure uniformity of procedure. With that assurance I think I may ask your Lordships to read it a second time.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2a."—(*The Earl of Onslow.*)

On Question, Motion agreed to.

Read 2a (according to order), and committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

MACEDONIA.

*__Earl SPENCER__ rose to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the independence from interference by the Turkish Government of the European officers appointed to reorganise and direct the *gendarmerie* in Macedonia has been duly secured, and what powers have been placed in their hands, and what progress has been made by the civil agents appointed by the Austrian and Russian Governments to supervise the improvements in the civil administration of the Macedonian provinces which have been promised. He said: My Lords, this matter, which is one of great importance, has already occupied the attention of both Houses of Parliament during the present session; but I think the time has come when it is desirable to get an authoritative declaration from the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs as to the existing state of affairs in Macedonia. We have had two discussions upon this matter in your Lordships' House, and on both those occasions the noble Marquess made exceedingly important statements. What had happened at that time was that two of the great European Powers, with, no doubt, the consent, and I suppose the approval, of the other great Powers, were proceeding to carry out, and tried to carry out, certain important reforms in Macedonia. Those reforms were intended to improve the ordinary administration of law and justice and to effect a reorganisation of the constabulary. At that time there was considerable hope that the reforms would be effected, and if they had been effected we might have looked forward to peace being maintained in Macedonia and to an end being put to the disastrous troubles there.

The scheme of reform of the administration was accompanied by a proposal that two European civil assistants should be appointed to see that these reforms were properly carried out. I think this proposal was made at the instance of the noble Marquess; and I am sorry to think that he made it an alternative to a much greater and, as it seems to me, a much better proposal—namely, that the government of Macedonia should be under the control of one Christian Governor. From what we hear of the work of these two civil assistants, I am afraid that very little has been done. So far as we know the two civil assistants have remained where they landed and have been altogether useless. With regard to the question of the *gendarmerie*, which is exceedingly important, it was proposed that a European officer should become the head of the *gendarmerie*; that he should have the complete control, as we understood it, of the police in Macedonia, and that he should have sufficient power to carry out his duties. It was a long time before anything was done, but after a time a distinguished Italian General — General de Giorgis — was appointed, and he proceeded to Constantinople. There he remained for many weeks endeavouring to get the arrangements for his administration carried out. After a time he succeeded to a certain extent, and went to Macedonia to commence his duty.

We learn that the proposals that were intended to be carried out have really been almost nullified, or at any rate so minimised that it will be impossible for the Inspector-General to carry out his work effectively. First of all we were told that sixty European officers were to be appointed to assist him, to be under his control, and to be responsible for the administration of justice in various parts of the country. But we are told that the Sultan has, up to the present time, refused to grant these sixty officers. He has only agreed to find twenty or twenty-five officers to work under General de Giorgis. If that be the case, it really looks as if the whole of this scheme has broken down, for twenty or twenty-five officers is quite an insufficient number for the administration of a district containing nearly 20,000 square miles. I should like to know, further, whether the Inspector-General has effective power. We are told in another place that he has the power to order and control the European officers under him, but we do not hear whether the European officers under him have the power to order and control the Turkish officers and men under them. It seems to be a prevalent idea that they, and even the Inspector-General, will be mere reporting officers and will really have no effective control over the police and the administration of justice.

I should like to know whether we are correctly informed, or whether the noble Marquess can say that this scheme will be effective in its operation. We are told, and we know, that this scheme which Austria and Russia were to carry out is the minimum that would be acceptable. On previous occasions the noble Marquess has made some very important statements on this matter. On the first occasion he said—

> "We have made it perfectly plain to all concerned that, if these schemes should fail to produce the desired result, we reserve to ourselves entire liberty to take into consideration and to propose alternative and more far-reaching measures."

Speaking on the Motion of my noble friend Lord Newton, on 15th February, he said—

> "If the gendarmerie can be reorganised it is not too much to hope that the people of the Balkan Peninsula who are watching these events with so much anxiety may be re-assured and may be content to abstain from any action calculated to produce a fresh crisis at the beginning of the spring. I may be too sanguine, but I do earnestly hope that the experiment now being tried, to which we are to some extent committed, will be given a fair trial, and if, having received such a trial, it fails to produce the result we anticipate, then I think noble Lords will be amply justified in asking the Government to carry out the pledges they have given and calling upon them to put forward more drastic and more thorough measures of reform."

What will the noble Marquess now say? I fear from what we hear that these schemes have failed. If they have failed, we may call upon him to fulfil his pledges and to take some further steps in order to secure peace and quiet in these districts. It is of immense importance that this should be done now. We have passed the trying winter, when it is almost impossible to carry on warfare, and now is the time when there is great fear that there may be a recurrence of those terrible encounters which resulted in so much bloodshed during last year—encounters in which many lives were lost, great cruelty was perpetrated on the unfortunate inhabitants of the country, villages were destroyed, and all the horrors of civil war were present. I fear there is now great alarm lest these encounters should recur. The only hope is that the population may rely on these reforms being carried out effectively, that they may rely on what the Powers may do.

I think it was said in another place that it was evident in the country that there was an inclination on the part of the population to rely upon the assurances and the sincerity of the European Powers instead of exposing themselves once more needlessly to the perils and sufferings of a perfectly useless struggle. That is an important statement; and I cannot help thinking, from what I hear, that there is a great deal of force and truth in it—that the population do rely upon the Great Powers, and rely a great deal more upon the influence and interest of this country than, possibly, upon those of any other country. This throws a heavy responsibility on all the Great Powers, and among them, no doubt, on Great Britain and the noble Marquess who so ably presides over the Foreign Office. I most earnestly and sincerely hope, in the face of the difficulties which exist in these districts, the terrible suffering that is going on, and the obstinate determination of the Sultan to refuse these reforms or any change of government unless he is absolutely pressed, that the noble Marquess will consult the Great Powers and see whether they cannot support and give greater effect to the mandate which has been issued and received by Russia and Austria, and really bring pressure to bear on the Sultan in order that these reforms in Macedonia may take place.

LORD NEWTON: My Lords, as the noble Earl has referred to observations which I previously made on this question, perhaps I may be permitted to interpose for a few minutes in the discussion. The noble Earl has put upon the Paper a Question which, without usurping the functions of the Foreign Secretary, I should like to have the privilege of answering myself. The noble Earl asks what progress has been made by the civil agents appointed by the Austrian and Russian Governments. To that question I reply, without the slightest hesitation, that no progress whatever has been made, and I do not see any prospect of any progress being made by them in the future. These two gentlemen, who, by the way, represent the collective wisdom of Europe, have been established for something like four months in Salonika. They have never left that town. They are the objects of the mingled pity and contempt of the Europeans in the neighbourhood, and, as I said before, I do not think there is any prospect of their discharging any more useful work than they have accomplished hitherto. I may add that it is a source of perpetual and never-ending astonishment to the inhabitants of those regions that the two civil agents take implicitly for granted everything that is told them by Hilmi Pasha, and never take the slightest trouble to verify the information. So much for the civil agents.

With reference to the general situation, I rather gather from the remarks of the noble Earl that he thinks that everything can be put right if sufficient pressure is put upon the Turkish Government. I would like to remind the noble Earl and the House that this work has practically been taken out of the hands of the Turkish Government, and has been delegated by Europe to the Austrian and Russian Governments. I agree with the noble Earl that their action so far has been as nearly as possible a complete failure, although the high-sounding reforms promised under the so-called Murzsteg Programme have dwindled into an emasculated scheme for the reform of the *gendarmerie*. Even that particular portion of the reforms has been so successfully emasculated by the obstruction of the Turkish Government, and by the apathy of the Austrian and Russian Governments, that I gather it is not worth very much at the present moment.

One instance which is not altogether devoid of humour may bring home to your Lordships some sense of the obstruction practised with regard to the *gendarmerie* officers. The British delegate, who happened to be the Military Attaché at Vienna, was appointed by our Government either at the end of last year or at the beginning of January. His Majesty's Government were laudably anxious to be first in the field. This gentleman's presence was so urgently desired in the interior of Macedonia that he was telegraphed for to come immediately, and he had, in consequence of this urgent summons, to throw over the Emperor of Austria, with whom he was engaged to dine that day. That officer, who arrived in Constantinople in the beginning of January, was detained there till the middle of April. That will give the House a fair impression of the delay that is taking place with regard to this matter.

I do not like to destroy agreeable illusions. I observe that it is generally taken for granted in official circles—I am not speaking particularly of British official circles—that everything is going to end in a favourable manner, and the foundation for this appears to consist largely in the fact that what is called the Turco-Bulgarian Agreement has been arrived at, and that the *gendarmerie* officers have arrived. As for the Turco-Bulgarian Agreement, in my opinion it is not worth more than the paper it is written on, because I am firmly convinced that neither side intends to adhere to it. I do not desire to appear either as a pessimist or an alarmist, but in the course of the journey which I took recently in European Turkey I was enabled to gauge the opinion of almost every section, and in my travels I only came across two persons who might fairly be described as optimists. One of these persons was Hilmi Pasha, the Inspector-General of the Macedonian Provinces, and the other was the Sultan himself. I am prepared to admit that these are important personages and that their opinion ought not to be disregarded, but at the same time it would hardly do to consider them absolutely impartial authorities on the question. On the other hand, I found that every single independent person whom I came across, with always the exception of Austrian and Russian agents, took an extremely gloomy view of the future, not only because of the incapacity and the unwillingness of the Turkish Government, but because of the profound distrust which is universally felt with regard to the attitude and intentions of the Austrian and Russian Governments, and I must say I see nothing whatever surprising in this view. Can anybody mention one single solitary instance in which either of these two Governments have shown the slightest desire to improve the condition of Turkey, either in Europe or in Asia? On the contrary, everybody knows that it has been the object of one of these Powers at all events—namely, Russia—to weaken the Turkish Government and to keep the country in as unsound a condition as is possible, with very obvious objects.

The situation in what we call Macedonia, which, in official circles, is looked upon as favourable, is, as a matter of fact, very little better than it was a year ago. The state of that country is very little removed from a state of war at the present moment. It is full of unpaid, and, in many instances, demoralised troops; every yard of railway has to be guarded by soldiers; there are thousands of unfortunate people whose houses have been burned, and who have got nothing to live upon and no place in which to live; and there are thousands of refugees outside the country who are supported by charity. An amnesty has, I understand, just been proclaimed, but the result of an amnesty in that country is that nearly everybody who is let out of gaol joins an insurgent band on the first opportunity. What is most important of all, the Musssulman population is in a dangerously excited condition. It would not take very much, I am afraid, to provoke a massacre on an extensive scale and nobody can say what a massacre would lead to at the present moment. It would lead to a wide-spread insurrection, and to a war between Bulgaria and Turkey, and there is no one who can say what that would eventually develop into. I say that no one who travels in that part of the world at the present moment can fail to realise that there is in that country the typical lull before the storm, and that it is only a question of how soon the storm is going to break out.

What are the guarantees against an explosion of the kind I have mentioned? So far as I can see, the sole guarantee consists in the presence of the foreign officers, whose functions will be defined to us this afternoon. When I was in what is called the disturbed districts, I was assured on all sides that the one and only chance of preventing a disturbance was the prompt appearance of foreign officers dressed in foreign uniforms, who should be independent of the Sultan and really possess executive powers. Even the presence of these foreign officers may lead to considerable difficulty. The Austrian officers are going to be sent to the one district in which the inhabitants, both Mussulmans and Christians, are firmly determined they will not have them if they can possibly prevent it. In face of this fact, this particular area has been allotted to the Austrian officers, and I shall be surprised if their appearance in these regions is not followed by unfortunate results.

There is one satisfactory feature upon which I may touch. Nothing surprised me more when I was in that country than the universal confidence which appeared to be felt in British policy. It was a most agreeable surprise to me, because I never experienced anything of the kind before; but the fact remains that both Mussulmans and Christians do feel the most implicit confidence in the intentions of the British Government. They realise that we, at all events, have got clean hands in the matter and do not desire to derive any material advantage from the situation. Therefore, whatever may happen to the other foreign officers, I think I am safe in prophesying that the British officers will meet with a cordial reception wherever they may find themselves. I gather, not only from the speech of the noble Earl but from speeches made by other persons, that it is considered that this country should take some more decided action in the matter. I sometimes wonder whether gentlemen who take that view quite appreciate the difficulty in which His Majesty's Government find themselves, and I do not think sufficient justice has been done to the persistent efforts which have been made by the noble Marquess the Foreign Minister and his representatives abroad in order to secure a better state of things.

I will go so far as to say that almost everything good which has been effected has been due almost solely to the action of the noble Marquess and of the British Ambassador at Constantinople, Sir Nicholas O'Conor. I have said that our hands are clean in this matter; our policy is directed solely from disinterested, and, I should say, humanitarian motives. I am not going to assert that other nations are less humanitarian in their sympathies than we are, but at the same time this is the only country which allows its foreign policy to be dictated, or even influenced, by humanitarian considerations; and the difficulty in the way of His Majesty's Government adopting an energetic attitude on this particular question is that there is no likelihood, or very little likelihood, of their being supported by any other Government. The noble Marquess is not in a position to admit what I say, but your Lordships may take it from me that my assertion is practically true. I say that we, with the exception of the French, are the only people whose hands are clean in this matter, and who do not seek to obtain material advantages from the present situation, and everyone will recognise the extreme difficulty which the French Government would have in acting with us at the present moment.

With regard to the future, I should deprecate isolated action on our part. I believe there are some individuals who would like to urge that the British Fleet should be sent to Salonika or somewhere else for the purpose of terrifying the Turkish Government. I believe the results would be much worse if we attempted anything of that sort than they are likely to be under present circumstances; but I would venture to suggest to the noble Marquess that this scheme of entrusting the pacification and amelioration of this country to the Austrians and the Russians, if it has not broken down already, is bound to break down before long. It is an arrangement which cannot work. Although everybody approved of it at the time, it is obvious to me, after what I have seen, that it is impossible that it can ever be anything else than a merely temporary and unsatisfactory arrangement. What I do very respectfully suggest to the noble Marquess is this, that the question is one of such extreme complication and difficulty, there are so many nationalities and different questions involved, that it cannot be solved by the rough and ready plan which has been adopted. In my opinion, the only way in which the situation could be adequately dealt with is by means of a conference before which the respective interests of all these different nationalities could be fairly considered, and, what is no less important, the interests of the Mussulman population would be considered as well as those of the Christian population. I believe that in the adoption of this principle of a conference or congress the ultimate solution of this difficulty lies; and I urge this, in conclusion, that I firmly believe that if an opportunity were obtained of proposing a conference, and if the assent of Europe could be obtained to the conference, it would not only have the best possible effect in the future, but it would have the immediate effect of restraining revolutionary bodies and preventing them from rising, for they would then know that European diplomacy was really in earnest in desiring to do something for them.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (The Marquess of LANSDOWNE): My Lords, I do not know whether the noble Earl will be content with the answer which my noble friend so kindly volunteered on my behalf, but it is perhaps necessary that I should supplement it by a few words. With some of the observations he addressed to your Lordships I certainly do not disagree.

Let me say at once that he will not find me in the ranks of the incurably optimistic officials of whom he has spoken. I am, on the contrary, one of those who regard with great apprehension the condition of things in the Balkan Peninsula, and think, with my noble friend, that we have too much reason to be disappointed with the progress which has up to the present time been achieved in the carrying out of the scheme of reforms; I feel, as he does, that if the rate of progress is not accelerated we shall be confronted with a situation giving rise to the gravest anxiety.

In one or two of my noble friend's observations I certainly did not concur, I do not, for example, agree with him when he tells your Lordships that the intervention of Austria and Russia has had the effect of relieving the Porte from all responsibility in this matter. I do not think that is the case. We all know that, however promising may be the measures of reform put forward for the acceptance of the Turkish Government, and however readily those reforms may be accepted, there is always left a great deal of room for the exercise of those arts of delay and obstruction in which, I am afraid, it must be said, Turkish officials are usually found to excel. Again, I do not agree with my noble friend in his belief that the agreement which has been concluded between Turkey and Bulgaria is not worth the paper on which it is written. In my belief that agreement is likely, at any rate, to lead to some useful results; and it will have this result, amongst others, that it will greatly strengthen the hands of the Bulgarian Government in checking the insurrectionary movements which have used Bulgarian territory as a base of operations, and which the Bulgarian authorities have in the past had great difficulty in restraining.

My noble friend made, not for the first time, a complimentary reference, which I greatly appreciate, to the efforts of His Majesty's Government, and particularly to our representative at Constantinople, in promoting the cause of reform. My Lords, let me say that so far as Sir Nicholas O'Conor is concerned that compliment appears to me to be well deserved. It is impossible to exaggerate the value of the continued and strenuous efforts which Sir Nicholas O'Conor has made during the last few months in endeavouring to bring about an improvement in the state of things in the Balkan Peninsula. He has found the means of commanding the confidence of the Sultan, and his position has been undoubtedly strengthened by the knowledge that the advice he has given to the Turkish Government is of an absolutely disinterested character and designed solely for the good of all concerned. One word more with regard to my noble friend's speech. He suggested to us the appointment of a European conference. I would ask my noble friend whether he is quite sure that if a conference were to be assembled to-morrow we should really be much nearer the satisfactory solution that we all desire? I have always been under the impression that a conference of the Powers does not hold out much hope of success unless before the conference is assembled there is some reason for believing that the Powers concerned will enter into it in general agreement as to the means which might be adopted of dealing with the questions at issue. We have had some experience of the difficulties encountered even by two Powers in dealing with this problem; and I own that I should be sorry to speak with entire confidence of the prospects of a conference assembled without a previous understanding and merely with the object of what I may describe as fishing for a solution of the Macedonian question. And surely it is fair to say that of all the calamities which could befall these much afflicted regions, none could be greater than that a conference should assemble and should separate without having discovered a means of putting an end to this grievous condition of things. Then, indeed, something like despair would overtake these long-suffering populations, and we might look forward with the gravest anticipation to the result which such a feeling might produce upon their minds.

And now, my Lords, I will endeavour to answer the Questions put by the noble Earl, with regard to the European officers who are to be employed with the Macedonian *gendarmerie*, and with regard to the two high officials who are to be attached to the staff of the Inspector-General. First as to the number of the European officers. It is quite true that at this moment only twenty-five are to be sent out; but the number originally mentioned was sixty, and the Powers have made it clear that they do not depart from their original demand, and that they reserve to themselves the right of sending additional officers at the proper time. I may say that General de Giorgis, who is to have command of the force, expressed the opinion that for the present and as a beginning twenty-five officers was a sufficient number. The officers to be employed are of two classes. There are, in the first place, seven staff officers—officers of senior rank who are attached to the General, and who will not be in the Turkish service, and who will consequently not wear the Turkish uniform. In the second place, there are the twenty-five European officers already mentioned who will be attached to the *gendarmerie* and who will be in the Turkish service

The noble Earl is anxious to know something of the degree of authority and independence which will belong to these officers. I think I may say that both classes will have very extensive powers and a very considerable amount of independence of the ordinary Turkish administration. That will be the case, although they will not be in immediate or executive command of the *gendarmerie* in the sense in which a regimental officer has executive command of the troops under his charge. That point was very carefully considered; and both Sir Nicholas O'Conor and the distinguished officer who has been appointed as British staff officer with General de Giorgis—Colonel Fairholme—advised that, all things considered, it would be better that these officers should not have executive command. They thought, to begin with, that it was not desirable that British officers should be in actual command of Turkish troops. They believed that the authority of the officers would be greater, and not less, if their position was made to differ from that of the ordinary Turkish officer; finally, by putting them in a special position of this kind, we relieve them from the necessity of taking the oath of allegiance to the Sultan, which would have been necessary if they had been actually in executive command.

The senior, or staff, officers will be the advisers of the General in all matters concerning the administration, the training of the force, and its organisation. They will report to the general and receive their instructions from him. As to the remaining European officers, all orders issued to the *gendarmerie* will be either sent through these officers or communicated to them and transmitted, in case they are given to them, to the Turkish officers in executive command of the troops; and, what is very important, it will be the duty of the European officers to see that those orders are carried out and to report to the General if there is any failure to comply with the orders or to obstruct their execution. Another important point as bearing on the position of the officers is this. The European officers will be irremovable except in consequence of a decision of a special committee presided over by the General himself. But while they are to be irremovable, they are to have the right of calling for the dismissal or removal from the corps of any members, officers or men, who are disobedient, obstructive, or inefficient. These are, so far as we have been able to ascertain, the functions of these European officers; but I should make it clear that the Powers reserve to themselves the right of revising these arrangements should they be found to work unsatisfactorily in practice.

I should like to add one other observation with regard to these officers. I think it would be a mistake to suppose that their authority and position will depend entirely upon the terms of their appointment or the regulations subject to which they will serve. They will serve in the *gendarmerie* not merely in the capacity of assistants to the General, but as representatives of the Powers by whom they are appointed and they will have exceptional opportunities of watching the progress of events in these provinces and reporting upon them from time to time. I do not think that at any moment we have yet had an opportunity of obtaining the kind of evidence which it may be hoped we shall be able to obtain from them.

Passing to the civil assistants of the Inspector-General, I am constrained to say with much regret that I am not able to describe their achievements in language much more reassuring than that which my noble friend has used. They were appointed with the expectation that they would be able to direct the attention of the Inspector-General to the needs of the Christian population; and I think we all of us supposed that, in order that they might be able to exercise that extremely important function, they would be officials of a peripatetic description, who would make tours in their districts and endeavour to see with their own eyes what was going on in them. I regret extremely to say that differences of opinion have arisen with regard to these tours; and I understand that the Turkish Government has insisted that if such tours are to take place the civil assistant is invariably to be accompanied by a Turkish official, and that this restriction has been objected to, with the result that the tours have not taken place. The controversy, I believe, is still proceeding; and up to the present time I am afraid it is impossible to point to any very special results from the presence of these officials. I may say that we have invited the two Governments concerned to supply us if possible with any reports which may have been furnished by the civil assistants, but up to the present we have not succeeded in obtaining any such documents.

I think I have now said all I am able to say in reply to the specific Questions of the noble Earl. With regard to the general situation, I can only once more express my regret that the progress which has been made with these reforms should have been so tardy. I might almost say that at times it has been heartrending to find the number of minor difficulties which apparently have cropped up on every side to prevent the expeditious carrying out of arrangements which every one professes to desire. We can only promise your Lordships that, so far as we are concerned, we shall continue to use such influence as we may be able to exercise for the purpose of expediting these measures of reform and for the purpose of inculcating moderation and self-restraint where those qualities are most needed.

LORD TWEEDMOUTH: My Lords, on the last occasion when the noble Marquess spoke on this subject he suggested that the Government might be assisted in the future by action being taken by Members of both Houses to encourage them and strengthen their hands. What is the situation to-day? Your Lordships have heard the statement of a Member of this House, who certainly has not the character of being an anti-Turk. You have heard what he has seen during his recent visit to the Balkan provinces, and you have heard him describe the imminent danger of massacre. Exactly the same thing was hinted at by *The Times* correspondent in to-day's paper. The snow has gone, and now is the time when an outbreak is likely to occur. In face of that, I ask the House, can we accept the statement we have just heard from the noble Marquess as satisfactory, or say that it seems to indicate any great hope of successfully battling with the situation in these countries? I fully acknowledge the difficulties of the situation and the difficulties which the Government have to face. Still it does seem to me that the speech of the noble Marquis is almost a confession of impotence. All the great Powers are agreed that the present situation should be put an end to. The duty of carrying out the views of the Powers has been entrusted to Russia and Austria. I think it is an unfortunate thing that these two Powers should be the very Powers which have the greatest interests in these territories. It is also an unfortunate thing that one of those Powers should at this moment have its hands very full elsewhere. Is there no hope that the other great Powers may be able to bring some influence to bear upon them to force them to take some action? I believe Lord Newton has declared quite truly the confidence of the population of these provinces in British good intentions and British power. I wish we had heard the noble Marquess announce some intention to endeavour to influence somehow—it is not for me to suggest how—Russia and Austria; and, if we cannot do that, to act on our own behalf in conjunction with France and Germany. The time is passing quickly, and if prompt action is not taken we may expect a renewal of the terrible incidents which have lately been so frequent. Surely it is a scandal that the Sultan should be able to turn the jealousies, desires, and ambitions of the

European Powers to his own advantage, to use them for the purpose of leaving these wretched subjects of his in their present terrible condition. I do not wish to say a word which would add to the difficulties of the situation; but I desire that Members of Parliament should adopt the course suggested by the noble Marquess on a former occasion, and I hope the effect of their action will be to enable the Government to take some more decided action than they have yet indicated.

House adjourned at a quarter before Six o'clock till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 5*th May*, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Hampton-in-Arden Gas Bill. Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Ipswich Dock Commission Bill [Lords] (King's Consent signified). Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill. Read the third time, and passed.

City of London (Central Criminal Court House) Bill. "To authorise the raising by borrowing of money for the provision and erection of premises for the Sessions of the Central Criminal Court," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time.

Land Drainage Provisional Order. Bill to confirm a Provisional Order under The Land Drainage Act, 1861, relating to lands in the parishes of Owston and West Butterwick, in the county of Lincoln (Parts of Lindsey), ordered to be brought in by Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes and Mr. Victor Cavendish.

Land Drainage Provisonal Order Bill. "To confirm a Provisional Order under The Land Drainage Act, 1861, relating to lands in the parishes of Owston and West Butterwick, in the county of Lincoln (Parts of Lindsey)," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills and to be printed. [Bill 180.]

London United Tramways Bill. Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

RAILWAY BILLS (GROUP No. 8).

Mr. HENRY HOBHOUSE reported from the Committee of Group No. 8 of Railway Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, they had adjourned till Tuesday next, at half-past Eleven of the clock. Report to lie upon the Table.

London and India Docks Company Bill. Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to provide against the destruction of undersized flat fish." [Sea Fisheries Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to authorise the Chesterfield Gas and Water Board to make new waterworks and extend their gasworks; and for other purposes." [Chesterfield Gas and Water Board Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to empower the Corporation of Harrogate to construct a temporary tramroad, telephonic communication, and other works in connection with their waterworks; and for other purposes." [Harrogate Waterworks Tramroad Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act for empowering the Corporation of Leeds to construct certain temporary railways and works to facilitate the construction of their authorised waterworks in the Valley of the Burn, and to authorise the placing of electric lines in certain highways; and for other purposes." [Leeds Corporation (Waterworks) Railway Bill [Lords.]

And, also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confer further powers upon the Neath, Pontardawe, and Brynaman Railway

Company for the construction of Railways and the raising of capital: and for other purposes." [Neath, Pontardawe, and Brynaman Railway Bill [Lords.]

Private Legislation Procedure (Wales) Bill. That they give leave to the Lord Balfour of Burleigh to attend to be examined as a Witness before the Select Committee on the Private Legislation Procedure (Wales) Bill.

Chesterfield Gas and Water Board Bill [Lords]; Harrogate Waterworks Tramroad Bill [Lords]; Leeds Corporation (Waterworks) Railway Bill [Lords]; Neath, Pontardawe, and Brynaman Railway Bill [Lords]. Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

PETITIONS.

BISHOPRICS OF SOUTHWARK AND BIRMINGHAM BILL.

Petition from Lavender Hill, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION ACT, 1902.

Petition from Hull, for alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Dunkeld, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

LICENCES (RENEWAL.)

Petitions against alteration of Law; from Baildon; Wardoun; Liverpool; Llandrindod Wells; Moss Side; Llanidloes (four); Upper Parkstone; Oldham; East Yorkshire; Newtownards; Greenwich; Hindley; Lincoln's Inn Fields; Kilburn; Cheshunt; Walthamstow; Nuneaton; Acocks Green; Holborn; Talenfoel; Shaftesbury Avenue; Manchester; Street; Thornley; Leicester; Sileby; Windsor; and Little Dean; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions against; from Stourbridge; Leominster (two); West Sleekburn; Bradford and Halifax; Lower Wortley; Morpeth; Lavender Hill; Higher Openshaw; Croydon; Wakefield; Glossop; Halstead; Westerhope; Twickenham; Scotswood; Shiremoor; Woodside (four); Falkirk; Sheffield; Forest Hall; Wensleydale; Market Harborough; Shankhouse; Amble; West Cramlington; Carlisle; Chelsea; Elgin; Newcastle; Nenthead; Pegswood; and Bishop Auckland; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petition from Edinburgh, for extension of provisions to Scotland; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL AUTHORITIES (TAXATION AND PURCHASE OF LAND) BILL.

Petition from Hackney, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RE-VACCINATION BILL.

Petitions in favour; from Stockport; and Holborn; to lie upon the Table.

TRADES UNIONS AND TRADE DISPUTES BILL.

Petition from the Scottish Trade Protection Society, against; to lie upon the Table.

TRADES UNIONS AND TRADE DISPUTES (No. 2) BILL.

Petition from the Scottish Trade Protection Society, against; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

MALTA.

Copy presented, of Further Correspondence relating to the Political Condition of Malta [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

VICTORIA (THE ELECTORAL DISTRICTS BOUNDARIES ACT, 1903).

Copy presented, of The Electoral Districts Boundaries Act, 1903 (Victoria) No. 1895 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 159.]

VICTORIA (THE ELECTORAL PROVINCES BOUNDARIES ACT, 1903).

Copy presented, of The Electoral Provinces Boundaries Act, 1903 (Victoria) No. 1896 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No 160.]

FISHERY BOARD (SCOTLAND).

Copy presented, of Twenty-Second Annual Report of the Fishery Board for Scotland, being for the year 1903. Part I., General Report [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

MOTOR CARS (DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE).

Copy presented, of Report of the Departmental Committee appointed by the President of the Local Government Board to inquire with regard to regulations for the purposes of Section 12 of The Motor Car Act, 1903. Part I. Report [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

MOTOR CARS (DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE).

Copy presented, of Report of the Departmental Committee appointed by the President of the Local Government Board to inquire with regard to regulations for the purposes of Section 12 of The Motor Car Act, 1903. Part II. Minutes of Evidence, Appendix, and Index to Evidence [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3151 and 3152 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

Temporary Laws. Register of Temporary Laws for the Fifth Session, Twenty-seventh Parliament, of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, pursuant to Report of the Select Committee on Expiring Laws in Session 1866; to be printed. [No. 161.]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Improved Postal Arrangements at Castletown, Berehaven.

MR. GILHOOLY (Cork County, W.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether a steamboat or motor-car is to be used in the proposed arrangements for a better mail service to Castletown, Berehaven; and whether, before making final arrangements, he will elicit the opinions of the local public boards as to what would be the most convenient arrangements for the district.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) It has not yet been possible to make arrangements for improving the mail service to Castletown, Berehaven, either by steamboat or motor-car, but the inquiries on the subject are not yet completed. The officers of the Department in the locality are in a position to ascertain the wishes of those concerned, and I do not think that a formal consultation of the local public boards would be useful.

Moy (County Tyrone) Morning Mail.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): To ask the Postmaster-General under what circumstances the morning mail which formerly left Moy, county Tyrone, at 8 a.m., was discontinued; whether repeated applications have been made to have the service restored; and if he will consider the claim made by the traders of the town, so that business men may be able to communicate with Belfast and Dublin and have letters and parcels on the same day.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) The morning mail from Moy, to which the hon. Member refers, was discontinued seven or eight years ago because the amount of correspondence forwarded by it was too small to justify the expense incurred. Several applications have been received, principally from one resident, for the restoration of the service, but it was not considered that a mail at 8.0. a.m. would be warranted. Further inquiry, however, is now being made with the view of ascertaining whether there has been any recent change in the circumstances, and the result shall be communicated to the hon. Member.

National Telephone Company's Charges at Tunbridge Wells.

MR. GRIFFITH BOSCAWEN (Kent, Tunbridge): To ask the Postmaster-General whether his attention has been directed to the fact that, notwithstanding that it is laid down in the licence of the National Telephone Company that they may not charge a rental of more than £6 per annum for exchange facilities in the Tunbridge Wells area, they are demanding from their subscribers a sum of £6 5s. per annum, on the ground that the 5s. represents the stamp duty; and, if so, will he state whether such action is a contravention of the terms of their licence; and whether the Company have a right to take away a subscriber's instrument if the subscriber has refused to pay the additional 5s.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) The National Telephone Company is under no obligation so far as its licence is concerned to limit the charge in the Tunbridge Wells area to £6 per annum. The limits of charge for an unlimited local exchange service are £10 and £5 17s. 6d., and the Company may, under its licence, charge any sum within those limits. The agreement between the Corporation of Tunbridge Wells and the Company for the transfer of the Corporation telephone system did, I understand, contain a provision as to the Company's future charges to subscribers who had joined the Corporation system, but I am not prepared to offer an opinion as to the effect of that agreement in relation to the demand of the National Telephone Company that stamp duty on agreements for an exchange service shall be paid by subscribers.

Harbours of Refuge—Captain Frederick's Report.

MR. SOARES (Devonshire, Barnstaple): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he will lay upon the Table of the House the Report of Captain Frederick as to the number of lives which might have been saved if there had been a harbour of refuge on the coasts of North Devon or Cornwall.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) It is not usual to publish Departmental memoranda supplied to a Minister, but as the hon. Member desires it, I shall on this occasion be happy to lay upon the Table a note furnished to me by Captain Frederick which bears upon the point referred to in the Question.

Ley's Charity—Representation of the Parish of Combe Martin.

MR. SOARES: To ask the hon. Member for Tunbridge, as representing the Charity Commissioners, whether he can state what rights of representation are possessed by the Parish Council of Combe Martin, in North Devon, with regard to Ley's Charity, Combe Martin.

(*Answered by Mr. Griffith Boscawen.*) This is the case of an endowment now in course of determination by the Commissioners under The Board of Education Act, 1899. Hitherto the parish council have not possessed any right of representation, the charity being in the main a public elementary school and therefore excepted under Section 66 of The Local Government Act, 1894, from the provisions for representations given by Section 14. After determination, any question as to the educational portion, which is the bulk of the endowment, will be for the Board of Education to decide; and as to a very small non-educational portion which will remain under the jurisdiction of the Commissioners, consideration has been postponed until after this decision can be given.

Fees and Salaries of English and Irish Law Officers.

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury what were the amounts paid in fees and salaries respectively to the English and Irish Law Officers of the Crown during the year ending 31st March last.

(*Answered by Mr. Victor Cavendish.*) The amounts are as follows:—

	Salary.	Fees.		
	£	£	s.	d.
England:				
Attorney-General	7,000	12,921	7	9*
Solicitor-General	6,000	7,068	19	3†
Ireland:				
Attorney-General	5,000	1,721	12	0
Solicitor-General	2,000			

---

* Inclusive of £4,900 10s. for Alaska Arbitration, and £2,124 for British Guiana Arbitration.

† Inclusive of £2,633 3s. 6d. for Alaska Arbitration.

Reorganisation of the Customs Service.

MR. ERNEST GRAY (West Ham, N.) To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether any scheme of reorganisation has been submitted to the Treasury or is under the consideration of the Board of Customs which has for its object the transfer to another branch of the Customs service of some portion of the work of keeping the warehouse accounts now performed by the landing and warehousing staff of the department.

(*Answered by Mr. Victor Cavendish.*) The reply is in the negative.

Metropolitan Asylums Board and Vivisection.

DR. SHIPMAN (Northampton): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been drawn to recent proceedings of the Metropolitan Asylums Board; and whether he has yet received an application from the Board to register a place for the performance of experiments on living animals under The Cruelty to Animals Act, 1876; and, if so, whether he will give the House an opportunity of discussing the question before public money is diverted to such a purpose.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers Douglas.*) I have been furnished with a report of the recent proceedings of the Metropolitan Asylums Board in the matter referred to; but I have received no application for registration or for a licence under the Cruelty to Animals Act in connection therewith. If I receive any such application it will be my duty to consider and deal with it in accordance with the ordinary practice in such matters. The registration of premises at a smallpox hospital for the investigation of smallpox by means of experiment would not be an unprecedented step, and I am not aware that hon. Members would need any exceptional facilities for criticising this particular item of my administration.

Aggregate Annual Values of Licensed Premises.

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE (Somersetshire, E.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he can supplement his statement as to licences by giving, for each county and county borough, the aggregate annual values of hotels, other alehouses and beerhouses, respectively, within each area.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) I am not sure that I understand the object which my right hon. friend has in view in asking for figures in this form, but I doubt whether it would be useful to give the aggregate annual values as he suggests. I am, however, ready to consider in what manner and to what extent the statement which I have already laid before the House can, in due course, be supplemented so as to provide hon. Members with all necessary information.

Registration of Teachers of Music.

MR. AGG-GARDNER (Cheltenham): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education if he will state why the Order in Council, No. 18, dated 21st January, 1902, directing a supplemental register of qualified teachers of music to be formed, has not yet been carried into effect; and when the regulations dealing with this branch of teachers' registration will be issued.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) I am not aware of any Order in Council, No. 18, dated 21st January, 1902, directing the formation of supplemental registers of qualified teachers of music, but I presume that the hon. Member refers to the Order in Council, dated 6th March, 1902, directing the formation of a Registration Council. This Order contained in a schedule certain regulations as to the formation of a Register of Teachers. No. 6 of these regulations states that supplemental registers shall be established for various subjects of which music is one. The regulation, however, contained no detailed requirements as to the kind of attainments which were necessary in order to gain admittance to the register. Many very difficult questions are involved, and the whole question is receiving the careful consideration of the Board, the Consultative Committee, and the Registration Council. I am unable to state when the Board will be in a position to issue the necessary regulations for the establishment of these registers.

Construction of Harbour at Avoch, Ross-shire—Government Grant.

Mr. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Secretary for Scotland if he will state what sum it is proposed to grant in aid of the construction of a harbour at Avoch, Ross-shire.

(*Answered by Mr. A. Graham Murray.*) I have received no further information on this subject to that given in reply to the Question of the hon. Member on 11th February,† and as no notice of this Question has been given I have not been able to ask for further particulars.

Customs and Excise Duties.

Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL (Yorkshire, Cleveland): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he will state the amount of revenue derived from Customs duties under each head, and from Excise duties on beer and spirits, in the financial year 1899–1900, and the estimated amounts for 1904–5; and the duties existing in 1904–5 which have been imposed or increased since 1899–1900, together with the amounts which the additions to taxation are estimated to yield per annum.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) I.—Statement showing the amount of Revenue derived from Customs duties under each head, and from Excise duties on Beer and Spirits in the financial year 1899–1900, and the estimated amounts for 1904–5:—

Head.	1899–1900 (Net Receipts).			1904–5 (Estimated).			Estimated Revenue for 1904–5 +more or —less than Revenue for 1899–1900.
	Paid to Exchequer.	Paid to Local Taxation Accounts.	Total Revenue.	Payable to Exchequer.	Assigned for Local Purposes.	Total Estimated Revenue.	
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
CUSTOMS.							
Coal exported ...	—	—	—	2,000,000	—	2,000,000	+ 2,000,000
Coffee and Chicory	246,479	—	246,479	245,000	—	245,000	— 1,479
Currants, Raisins, and Dried Fruits...	424,211	—	424,211	430,000	—	430,000	+ 5,789
Spirits (Foreign and Colonial)... ...	4,898,930	234,380	5,133,310	4,450,000	203,400	4,653,400	— 479,910
Sugar	—	—	—	5,950,000	—	5,950,000	+ 5,950,000
Tea	4,628,946	—	4,628,946	8,500,000	—	8,500,000	+ 3,871,054
Tobacco and Snuff...	10,885,922	—	10,885,922	13,170,000	—	13,170,000	+ 2,284,078
Wine	1,729,540	—	1,729,540	1,350,000	—	1,350,000	— 379,540
Cocoa	198,997	—	198,997	275,000	—	275,000	+ 76,003
Beer...	18,481	608	19,089	20,000	600	20,600	+ 1,511
Miscellaneous ...	11,967	—	11,967	60,000	—	60,000	+ 48,033
Total Customs ...	23,043,473	234,988	23,278,461	36,450,000	204,000	36,654,000	+ 13,375,539
EXCISE.							
Beer Duty	11,887,923	457,227	12,345,150	13,100,000	437,000	13,537,000	+ 1,191,850
Spirit Duty ...	19,335,360	967,787	20,303,147	17,700,000	847,000	18,547,000	— 1,756,147
Total Excise Duty on Beer and Spirits	31,223,283	1,425,014	32,648,297	30,800,000	1,284,000	32,084,000	- 564,297
Aggregate Total ...	54,266,756	1,660,002	55,926,758	67,250,000	1,488,000	68,738,000	- 12,811,242

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxix., 1029.

II.—Statement showing the Duties existing in 1904–5 which have been imposed or increased since 1899–1900, together with the amounts which the additions to taxation are estimated to yield per annum :—

	Year in which imposed or increased.	Estimated yield in 1904–5 of the additions to taxation.
		£
Coal, etc., Exported—Duty imposed of 1s. per ton	1901	2,000,000
Spirits—Duty increased 6d. per gallon... ...	1900	1,000,000
Sugar—Duty imposed of 4s. 2d. per cwt. with varying rates according to polarisation of 2s. to 4s. 2d. per cwt....	1901	6,000,000
Molasses—Duty imposed according to sweetening matter varying from 1s. to 2s. 9d. per cwt.		
Glucose—Duty imposed, liquid 2s. per cwt., solid 2s. 9d. per cwt.		
Tea—Duty increased by 4d. per lb.	(2d. in 1900) (2d. in 1904)	4,000,000
Tobacco—Duty on unmanufactured and manufactured tobacco increased by 4d. per lb....	1900	2,000,000
Duties adjusted	1904	
Beer—Duty increased 1s. per barrel	1900	1,700,000
		£16,700,000

NOTE.—The estimate of the revenue yielded by the additions to taxation is purely hypothetical. It could only be based on a "rule of thumb" computation. That is to say, for example, the total yield of the Excise Duty on beer at 7s. 9d. per barrel in 1904–5 is estimated at £13,100,000; the addition of 1s. per barrel represents twelve ninety-thirds of the entire duty, therefore the yield of that 1s. is computed to be twelve ninety-thirds of £13,100,000, or (in round figures) £1,700,000, It will be observed that the total estimated revenue of 1904–5 from the Customs and Excise Duties shows an increase in the period compared of a little over £12,800,000; but the yield of the additions to taxation is computed at £16,700,000. The difference is partly due to the fact that the receipts in 1899–1900 were unduly swollen by the special clearances effected in anticipation of increases of duty on account of the war. Another cause of the difference is the falling off of the receipts from some of the consumable articles subjected to duty.

Valuation of Licensed Premises for Estate Duty.

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if it is the practice of the Board of Inland Revenue, in valuing licensed houses for the purposes of the Estate Duty, to assume that the licence will continue to be renewed for an indefinite or for what number of years; and whether it is practicable to lay a Statement of the practice of the Board, in dealing with the various interests connected with the sale of intoxicating liquors similar to Parliamentary Paper, No. 176, of Session 1890.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) The general rule in valuing licenced houses for the purpose of Estate Duty is (as was the case prior to 1894, and as was shown in Parliamentary Paper, No. 176, of 1890) to assume that the licence will be renewed continuously. But any special circumstances affecting the probability of continuous renewal in a particular case would be taken into consideration. The "Short Statement' presented on Tuesday, read in conjunction with Paper No. 176 of 1890, appears to give as much information as can be afforded in regard to the practice of the Department.

Government of India and Coolie Labour.

Sir CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether he will lay before the House a Return showing in what cases and on what grounds the Government of India has, since the date of the Commission of Inquiry into the coolie system in British Guiana appointed in 1870, forbidden, or, having once allowed, has stopped the export of indentured Indian coolie labour to foreign countries or to British colonies.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The only cases since 1870 in which the export of indentured Indian labour, after having once been allowed, has been stopped by the Government of India have been those of certain foreign colonies, and the cases of refusal by the Government of India to permit emigration have been confined to foreign countries and do not include any British colonies. In view of international susceptibilities it would not be expedient to publish the correspondence showing the grounds on which this action was taken.

Government Cultivation of Rubber in Burma.

Mr. GRIFFITH BOSCAWEN: To ask the Secretary of State for India whether the Government of India are planting rubber trees in Burmah, and also in other places, on an extensive scale; and, if so, whether, with a view of preventing injury to private enterprise, and having regard to the protests made by companies and individuals interested in rubber plantations, the Government will consider their decision.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) The Indian Forest Department is engaged in experiments with rubber trees of different kinds in Burma, Assam, and Bengal. The most important experiment is with the Para rubber tree in the Mergui district of Lower Burma. It will be on a sufficient scale to test the commercial value of this species of rubber in Burma. I am not aware that any protests have been made by individuals or companies interested in rubber plantations in India, and I am not prepared to order the discontinuance of the experiments which, if successful, will be of great benefit to India, and to the large forest estates of the Indian Government.

Sir John Stewart's Estate, County Tyrone.

Mr. MURNAGHAN (Tyrone, Mid): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that efforts are being made by the tenants on the property of Sir John Stewart, situate at Carrickmore, county Tyrone, to buy out their holdings under the Land Purchase Act, 1903, and that when application for terms was made to the owner he declined to state them, and referred the tenants to the agent of the Gresham Assurance Company for a reply; and, if so, can he state the purport of the reply, the number of years purchase asked, and what progress, if any, in the direction of a sale is being made.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) I understand that the tenants on this property are desirous of purchasing their holdings I have no information, however, on th other matters referred to in the Question. No application has been made to the Estates Commissioners in respect of the sale of the estate.

Compensation for Injuries by the Police—Case of Mr. W M'Gifford, of Hillsborough.

Mr. SEYMOUR ORMSBY-GORE (Lincolnshire, Gainsborough): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that Mr. W. M'Gifford, of Hillsborough, county Down, whose aid was invoked by the police during the riot on Sunday, 17th April, at Lisburn, was subsequently accidentally batoned by them, receiving injuries which necessitated immediate surgical attendance; and whether it is proposed to give him adequate compensation.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) Mr. M'Gifford, though he was asked to use his influence in preserving the peace, does not appear to have rendered the police any assistance. Indeed, after declining to assist them, he identified himself, at least by his presence, with the section of the crowd from whom the most violent and persistent stone-throwing proceeded. Under these circumstances there does not appear to be ground for compensation in respect of an injury to which M'Gifford exposed himself.

Foreign Spirit Sold as Irish Whisky.

Sir THOMAS ESMONDE (Wexford, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he has received any communication from the County Wexford United Agricultural Society with reference to the sale of foreign spirit as Irish whisky; and whether the Government proposes to take any steps in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) I have received a communication of the nature referred to. The matter is engaging the attention of the Department of Agriculture, which will take such action as may appear to be required in order to protect, as far as possible, the interests of Irish growers of cereals used in the production of genuine Irish whisky.

Appointment of Dr. Kirwan at Ballinasloe Lunatic Asylum.

Mr. ROCHE (Galway, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the election of Dr. Kirwan to the position of resident medical superintendant of the Ballinasloe Lunatic Asylum has yet been sanctioned; and, if not, what is the reason of the delay.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The appointment has not yet been sanctioned. The Lord-Lieutenant is in correspondence on the subject with the Committee of Management of the Asylum.

Applications for Reinstatement from Evicted Tenants in County Waterford.

Mr. POWER (Waterford, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will grant a Return showing the number of applications for reinstatement received from evicted tenants in the county Waterford by the Estates Commissioners, and also the number of cases in which negotiations for sale or actual sale has taken place.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) One hundred and fifty applications for reinstatement have been received on behalf of evicted tenants in the county Waterford. The interim Return of proceedings under the Act of 1903, which will shortly be laid upon the Table, will contain information in respect of the operations of the Act by order of counties.

Dunmanway Electoral Division.

Mr. EDWARD BARRY (Cork County, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the rural district council of Dunmanway requested the Local Government Board to divide the electoral division of Dunmanway into two electoral divisions; and, if so, will this arrangement be carried into effect.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) No such application has been made to the Board by the district council. A proposal of this character was considered by the council in January last, but no further action was taken in the matter.

Veterinary Officers — Compulsory Residence in their Districts.

Mr. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will direct that the veterinary inspectors appointed by local authorities under the Diseases of Animals Acts shall be obliged to reside in their district, as in the case of medical officers.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The orders made under these Acts have not hitherto contained any provision requiring that inspectors shall in all cases reside within their districts. In a large number of instances the inspectors are "existing officers" within the meaning of Section 115 of The Local Government (Ireland) Act, 1898, and the need for respecting their interests would be a bar to the enforcement of a regulation of the nature suggested. It would, of course, be open to local authorities, when making fresh appointments, to arrange with such inspectors as to their place of residence.

South Africa — Repatriation of Natives.

Mr. HUNTER CRAIG (Lanarkshire, Govan): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is aware that many thousands of natives, a considerable number of whom had achieved positions as farmers equal or superior to many of the poorer class of whites, who were removed during the war from the Thaba N'Chu, De Wet's Dorp, and Thaba Pachoa districts of the Orange River Colony, have not been permitted to return; and, if so, will he say whether the prevention of their repatriation has received the sanction of His Majesty's Government; and whether the natives in question, in consideration of services formerly rendered to the late Government of the Orange Free State, held a servitude over the lands formerly occupied by them.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*) I am informed by Lord Milner that no natives who had a right to be in Thaba N'Chu location have been refused permission to return or remain there, but more than 5,000 natives from other districts who had found their way there for various reasons during the war have been repatriated by the Native Commissioner to their homes in other parts of the colony. As regards De Wet's Dorp and Thaba Pachoa, Lord Milner states that he has no reason to believe that any natives have been prevented from returning, but that he will make further inquiries. Every effort has been made to obtain a judicial decision upon rights of natives in Thaba N'Chu district, but so far without result, though Government was willing to pay expenses. I am promised a full report by mail.

Wages for Chinese Coolies in Transvaal Mines.

MR. WHITLEY: To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can now state what regulation has been made to ensure that the rate of wages paid to Chinese coolies in the Transvaal mines shall be not less than that now paid to natives.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*) I am not yet able to give the ans wer to the hon. Member's Question.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Military Drafts for India.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether it has been brought to his notice that a number of young soldiers forming part of this year's Indian relief will not be landed in Bombay until late in this month, when the hot season has commenced; and if he can say why arrangements were not made to send these young soldiers, going on Indian service for the first time, earlier in the trooping season.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): The hon. and gallant Member doubtless refers to the drafts on the "Assaye" which was intended to leave England on the 20th March, a date not considered too late for young soldiers to proceed to India. The delay of a month caused by an accident to the ship was not considered sufficient to justify cancelling the departure of the drafts. It must be remembered that the Commander-in-Chief in India has discretionary powers as to accommodating in the hills any soldiers who are considered unfit for a summer in the plains. The women and children were given the option of going out next winter, an option of which a very few availed themselves.

Woolwich Arsenal—Payment of Bonuses to Suspended Workmen.

CAPTAIN NORTON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that of the men placed under suspension in Woolwich Arsenal on 7th April last many are entitled to a bonus; and seeing that no hope of re-employment is held out to them, will he see that the bonus due is paid without delay in order that they may go in search of work elsewhere.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The hon and gallant Member is under a misapprehension. Men are not kept under suspension if there is no hope of early employment for them, but are discharged on reduction and are paid any pension or bonus for which they may be qualified. Men selected for discharge on reduction are in the period intervening between such selection and their actual discharge given leave to seek employment elsewhere. Those who succeed in obtaining work are struck off as discharged on reduction, and are accorded all the privileges to which men who leave from such a cause are entitled.

CAPTAIN NORTON: Will the right hon. Gentleman see that men who wish to go to Canada or elsewhere to seek employment are paid their bonuses before they go?

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: If the hon. Member can give me particulars of any cases in which injustice has been done I will investigate them.

Indian Competitive Examinations for the Public Services.

COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India if he can now state to what extent competition has been abolished for entrance to civil State employment in India; if the abolition of competition applies only to natives of India; and if he will state into whose hands will fall the patronage which may arise from the abolition of competition.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): I have not yet received the Paper promised by the Government of India, and am not in a position to add anything to the answer given on my behalf by the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs on the 21st March last to the Question on this subject of the hon. Member for West Denbighshire.†

COLONEL NOLAN: It is more than a month since I asked for information and the right hon. Gentleman then wanted me to give him time?

MR. BRODRICK: I very much regret the delay. The information has been promised as soon as possible.

Licensing Bill—Compensation Provisions.

MR. CORBETT (Glasgow, Tradeston): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he is aware that much the greater part of the compensation under the Licensing Bill would go to brewery companies, and that a much smaller part would go to actual licencees; and, if so, if he can give the House an estimate of the proportions.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): I am quite unable to give my hon. friend any such estimate. I think the variety of circumstances and contracts under which licensed premises are held precludes the possibility of doing so. I can only say that even if the result is as my hon. friend prophecies; and appears to dread, it will afford no ground of quarrel with the principle on which this part of the Bill is based, viz., that the compensation shall be distributed between the persons interested in licensed premises in accordance with the extent of their interests therein.

The Purchase of Chilian Warships.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer what was the date of the contract to purchase the Chilian warships; what was the date and the amount of the first payment; whether the Treasury had any legal authority for making such payment; and whether he will lay upon the Table a copy of any correspondence on the subject between the Treasury and the Admiralty.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): The date of the contract was 2nd December, 1903. The date of the first payment was 23rd December, and the amount was a sum of £67,000 each to Messrs. Vickers, Sons and Maxim, Ltd., and to Messrs. Armstrong, Whitworth and Co. The matter was decided by the Cabinet, and there was no preliminary correspondence prior to the conclusion of the agreement.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: The right hon. Gentleman has not answered that part of the Question which asks whether the Treasury had any legal authority for making the first payment.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I have already explained to the House, more than once, the circumstances under which I took upon myself the responsibility of sanctioning this expenditure in anticipation of the Parliamentary approval, which has since been given.

Unregistered Friendly Societies and Income-Tax.

MR. GEORGE WHITELEY (Yorkshire, W.R., Pudsey): I beg to ask Mr.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxxii., 235.

Chancellor of the Exchequer under what decision or regulation an unregistered friendly society is debarred from recovering income-tax paid upon a small income, while a registered friendly society is able to do so; and will the reference to the Income-Tax Committee permit of an inquiry into this alleged unfair treatment of the large class of unregistered friendly societies.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The exemptions granted to friendly societies by the Income-Tax Acts are confined to those which are "legally established under any Act of Parliament relating to friendly societies," and are not therefore applicable to unregistered societies. The question is not included within the terms of reference to the Committee.

MR. GEORGE WHITELEY: Then is an unregistered society an illegal society, not possessing the same right in this matter as a legal society?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The hon. Member is now attempting to raise an argument on my answer. I did not say it was not a legal society, but I said the exemptions were confined by the Income-Tax Acts to those which are legally established under any Act of Parliament relating to friendly societies. That is a statutory condition which I see no reason to repeal.

MR. GEORGE WHITELEY: Cannot the matter be brought within the reference to the Income-Tax Committee?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I have said it is not included in the terms of the reference.

North Sea Fisheries.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he will state what sum was expended by the Treasury during the past financial year in connection with the Scottish portion of the work of the International Committee for investigations in the North Sea, and on what Vote the expenditure was placed; did any member of the International Committee receive a salary or remuneration out of this Vote; and, if so, will he quote the amount.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY (Mr. VICTOR CAVENDISH, Derbyshire, W.): The amount is £6,732 3s. 6d., subject to such corrections as the audit of the payments for March may require. The money was voted under the head of Scientific Investigation, Subhead P., in the Civil Service Estimates, Class IV. One member of the Council received £300 and his travelling expenses out of this grant.

Historical Welsh Manuscripts.

MR. ALFRED DAVIES (Carmarthen Boroughs): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he will state what progress has been made by the Royal Historical Commission in their inquiry into manuscripts printed in the Welsh language; and when there will be a further issue of volumes in connection with their investigations.

MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH: The Reports on the Peniarth, Panton, and Cwrtmawr collections of manuscripts in the Welsh language are being printed and will probably be issued before the close of the year.

Welsh Nonconformist Children in Church Schools.

*MR. ALFRED DAVIES: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Education if he will state the number of children of Nonconformist parents educated in Church schools in Wales by force of circumstances; and if he will give details as to the schools they attend in the various educational areas.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir WILLIAM ANSON, Oxford University): There is no religious census for Wales, and the Board have no information on this subject; consequently I am unable to furnish the details for which the hon. Member asks.

*MR. ALFRED DAVIES: Will the hon. Gentleman try and obtain the information?

SIR WILLIAM ANSON: No, Sir, I do not think it is the duty of the Board to inquire into the religious convictions of parents.

*Mr. ALFRED DAVIES: I agree with the hon. Gentleman, but this information can be obtained otherwise.

National Educational Council.

Mr. GEORGE KENYON (Denbigh Boroughs): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether a draft scheme for a National Educational Council has received the approval of the Board; and, if so, will he state who were the persons consulted by the Board in the settlement of the preliminary scheme; whether it will be laid upon the Table and an early opportunity afforded the House of Commons of discussing it.

Sir WILLIAM ANSON: No such scheme has received the approval of the Board of Education. A scheme for a joint education committee for certain purposes of the Act of 1902 has been considered by representatives of local education authorities for Wales and Monmouthshire. The Board understand that this scheme will in due course be submitted for the consideration of those authorities, and, if adopted by them, will be laid before the Board with a view to publication and subsequent approval. No persons were consulted by the Board; but the Board were glad to give such assistance as lay in their power to certain representatives of Welsh local authorities who approached them with a view to making the necessary preliminary arrangements for a joint committee. The scheme, when framed, will not be laid upon the Table of the House, but will be subject to the procedure set forth in Section 17 of the Education Act, 1902.

Education (Scotland) Bill.

Mr. CROMBIE (Kincardineshire): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether the Education (Scotland) Bill will be taken in Committee of the Whole House or sent to a Grand Committee.

The SECRETARY for SCOTLAND (Mr. A. Graham Murray, Buteshire): The Education (Scotland) Bill will be taken in Committee of the Whole House.

Irish Fishermen's Insurance Scheme.

Mr. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state why the new insurance scheme for fishermen in Ireland has not yet been put into operation, in view of the fact that it has been under consideration by the Congested Districts Board for the past two years; and whether, in view of the fact that the spring fishery season has now opened, efforts will be made to put it into operation without further delay.

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Mr. Wyndham, Dover): The scheme was settled by the Board in March last. It is not practicable to make arrangements for working it in time for the spring mackerel season.

Cooscroum Landing Place.

Mr. BOLAND: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the repeated promises to effect improvements at Cooscroum, county Kerry, have not yet been carried into effect by the Congested Districts Board; and whether he can now state on what day work will be commenced there.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The Board are providing rollers for the landing place at Cooscroum. They will be forwarded this week.

Local Government Surcharges in Tipperary.

Mr. CULLINAN (Tipperary, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the solicitor to the Tipperary Urban Council swore at the recent trial in the Court of King's Bench that on the evening after the surcharges were made the auditor assured him that, if a good rate collection was made for the half-year ending in March, the surcharges would not be enforced; and whether, seeing that this was the cause of the Council not moving till the auditor took action in December, and that a good collection has been made, he will have the auditor's assurance now adhered to, and further proceedings stayed.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The solicitor to the district council made a statement in his affidavit to this effect. But the auditor states that the solicitor misapprehended the purport of the conversation that passed, and that he gave the Solicitor no such assurance as is alleged. It is not open to the Government to review the decision of the King's Bench Division.

MR. CULLINAN said this matter was causing great friction locally, and if the surcharges were attempted to be enforced the Government would want the powers of the Coercion Act.

Edge Estate, Queen's County.

MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether negotiations for the sale of the Edge Estate, Queen's County, are proceeding before the Land Commission; and, if so, whether he can state what steps are being taken to restore to his farm or otherwise provide for Thomas M'Cormack, son of John M'Cormack, who was evicted off the property in 1883 for non-payment of rent.

The hon. Member complained of the striking out of the word "impossible" before "rent" in the last line.

*MR. SPEAKER: The correction is a very proper one to make.

MR. WYNDHAM: No application has been made to the Estates Commissioners in respect of the sale of this estate. An application for reinstatement has been received on behalf of the evicted tenant named, and will be considered.

Estates Commissioners' Rules.

MR. P. A. M'HUGH (Leitrim, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the rules of the Estates Commissioners under the Land Act of 1903 are not available for the use of Members in the Library; and, if so, can he make arrangements to have copies of those rules supplied to Members representing Irish constituencies.

MR. WYNDHAM: The rules in question are provisional rules, and it is not the practice to lay such rules on the Table of the House. They were published in the *Dublin Gazette*, and are on sale at all law stationers. I shall be pleased, however, to forward a number of copies to the Librarian, from whom hon. Members can obtain them. The rules, when they become final, will be presented to Parliament in accordance with the requirements of the Act.

MR. FLYNN (Cork County, N.): Will you also lay copies of the rules framed under former Land Purchase Acts?

MR. WYNDHAM: If the hon. Member will write to me on the subject I will see what can be done.

Armagh Workhouse Master's Salary.

MR. JOHN CAMPBELL (Armagh, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state on what grounds the Armagh Board of Guardians have recently proposed to raise their master's salary from £75 to £100 per annum; what is the pension drawn as ex-head-constable by the present master; and whether the Local Government Board intend to sanction the suggested increase of pay.

MR. WYNDHAM: The grounds on which the proposed increase is based are the completion of five years' efficient service; economy in the management of the workhouse and consequent saving to the rates; exclusion of tramps; increased duties, etc. The Local Government Board will sanction the increase. The master is in receipt of a pension of £58 a year from the Constabulary.

Westmeath Quarter Sessions.

MR. SULLIVAN (Westmeath, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the fact that in the county of Westmeath there has been little or no criminal business at some of the late quarter sessions held in that county; and that the County Court Judge presiding at these sessions has been repeatedly presented with white gloves on the opening of his Court because there was no criminal business to come before him; and, if so, whether, in view of the inconvenience and expense to jurors being brought long distances to attend the quarter sessions Courts, he will give instructions to have the county so scheduled as to notify to the jurors they need not attend on such occasions as are here referred to.

MR. WYNDHAM: White gloves were presented to the County Court Judge at the January and April quarter sessions. On each occasion the jurors received an intimation that their attendance was not necessary. These appear to be the only sessions at which white gloves were presented during the past ten years. The question of applying the provisions of the Act of 1897 to the county is under consideration.]

Rockfield Estate, County Kerry.

MR. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the tenants on an estate at Rockfield, Ballymacelligott, county Kerry, have been threatened by the agent with proceedings for the running gale, which has not been hitherto demanded, in consequence of their refusal to agree to the landlord's terms as to sale; if so, will he state whether the Estates Commissioners have any powers to inquire into the methods by which terms are sometimes forced upon tenants; and, if not, will he include provisions giving such powers fully in the present Land Bill, so as to secure equitable bargains in the interests of the State as well as the tenants.

MR. WYNDHAM: I have no information in respect of the first part of the Question. In sanctioning an advance the Estates Commissioners have due regard to all the circumstances of the case.

Irish Training College Grants.

MR. WILLIAM McKILLOP (Sligo, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the probable increase in the number of King's scholars in the training colleges of De La Salle and St. Patrick's under the increased grants now proposed for these institutions.

MR. WYNDHAM: Applications are before Government for an increase from 150 to 200 in the case of the De la Salle College at Waterford, and from 156 to 200 in the case of Our Lady of Mercy College at Blackrock. No similar application has been received from St. Patrick's College. The annual sum of £5,000 provided in the Development Grant Estimate for training colleges under private management will meet the cost of fifty additional male and sixty-nine female King's scholars.

Dundrum Petty Sessions.

MR. KENDAL O'BRIEN (Tipperary, Mid): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that at the petty sessions for the district of Dundrum, county Tipperary, several cases requiring to be dealt with by two justices have had to be adjourned by the resident magistrate for four months in succession, owing to the absence of a second magistrate; and, if so, whether, considering the inconvenience occasioned to solicitors, litigants, and witnesses through the foregoing circumstances, he will recommend the Lord Chancellor to consider the advisability of appointing suitable local gentlemen to the commission of the peace on their names being submitted to him.

MR. WYNDHAM: Petty sessions at Dundrum are held once a month. At the February and April sessions only one magistrate was in attendance. I have referred the hon. Member's Question to the Lord Chancellor.

Bank of Ireland and Government Moneys.

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Cork County, N.E.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he will lay upon the Table of the House the terms of the arrangement now subsisting between His Majesty's Government and the Directors of the Bank of Ireland under which they hold, pass on to the Exchequer, or otherwise deal with Imperial Revenue and other Irish Government moneys.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: As I stated in reply to the hon. Member for Waterford on the 25th April,† the revenue receipts paid into the Bank of Ireland are credited to the Exchequer on the day of receipt. The Exchequer Account and other Accounts of public money in Dublin are kept by the Bank of Ireland as current accounts. The only business for which special terms are arranged is the management of the Public Debt. The rates of remuneration now payable to the Bank for that service were fixed by the

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxxiii., 1059.

Bank Act, 1892, and were determined after inquiry by a Departmental Committee into all the relations between the Government and the Bank, special consideration being given to the benefit derived by the Bank from the use of the Government balances. The Act of 1892 prescribes that the rates then fixed shall continue in force till 1912.

The Unstemmed Tobacco Question.

MR. McKENNA (Monmouthshire, N.): I beg to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, in view of the large and exceptional import of unstemmed tobacco in the month of March in anticipation of the Budget proposals, he will grant a Select Committee to inquire who were the importers; and whether the import has been induced by information that it was intended to make such proposals.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The Prime Minister proposes to answer this Question. Perhaps the hon. Gentleman will address it to the right hon. Gentleman when he comes into the House.

MR. McKENNA, in asking the Prime Minister his Question, said he desired to state that, either by the alteration of the Clerk at the Table or by a printer's error, in the fourth line what stood now as a semi-colon should have been a comma. The original Question which he handed in would make that point perfectly clear.

*MR. SPEAKER: It is a printer's error.

MR. McKENNA went on to say that consequently the subject of inquiry would be both "who were the importers, and whether the import had been induced by information," etc.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): As far as I am able to judge, the printer's error to which the hon. Gentleman refers, even when supplemented by the comment which he has just given on that error, does not alter the substance of the Question. The Government do not propose to grant the Committee which he asks for. The facts, as I understand them, are these. The hon. Member came down with a prepared attack upon the honour of one of the members of the Government.

MR. McKENNA: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask you whether, if the Prime Minister makes such a statement as that, I shall have any opportunity to reply.

*MR. SPEAKER: I think it would not be in order or in accordance with the Rules governing Questions to enter into a statement having reference to a previous debate. Any explanation of that kind would have to be given at some other time.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR rose amid cries of "Withdraw."

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! If there was anything calling for withdrawal I should have said so.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am not sure, Sir, that I understand the full extent to which you desire your ruling to apply. Would you wish me not to refer to any of the incidents which occurred on Tuesday last?

*MR. SPEAKER: Yes. I think that to refer, in answer to a Question, to what took place on a previous debate would not be in order. The Question has been answered. I am not prepared to state that it is not possible to say anything more; but to refer to a previous debate would be out of order, as it is necessarily a matter that would involve debate.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): As the right hon. Gentleman has made a distinct accusation against my hon. friend, founded upon what happened the other day, would it not be desirable that it should be withdrawn as it cannot be further discussed?

*MR. SPEAKER: The right hon. Gentleman was putting his construction upon what he understood the hon. Member to have said. I stopped him at the earliest possible moment. I do not think there is anything to withdraw.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Perhaps I may say, in order to the relieve the mind of the right hon. Gentleman, that all I said was that the hon. Member came down with a prepared attack upon the honour of a member of the Government—[Cries of "Withdraw" and "You are repeating it."]

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I must appeal to you, Sir, whether under your ruling that is in order.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I am not going to add to it.

***Mr. SPEAKER**: I understand that the right hon. Gentleman desires to enter into nothing more. I understood that all he was doing was, in answer to the objection raised by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Stirling, to repeat the words he said under the impression that that would satisfy the right hon. Gentleman.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The fact of his having repeated the words rather gives greater emphasis to them. The right hon. Gentleman accused my hon. friend of having come down with a prepared attack upon the honour of a member of the Government. As that, according to your ruling, was an irregular statement to make in answering a Question, I ask, as my hon. friend cannot reply to it and as no one can discuss it, should the right hon. Gentleman not be called upon to withdraw it?

***Mr. SPEAKER**: I am quite sure the right hon. Gentleman, if he thought he had made any personal attack, would be the first to withdraw it. What I understood was that he was beginning to state his impression of the effect of the hon. Gentleman's speech. On a proper occasion in debate that would have been a construction which he might without breach of order have put upon what he understood to be the hon. Gentleman's accusation. That would not be an irregular expression on a proper occasion in debating what had been said by the hon. Member for Monmouth. What I stopped the right hon. Gentleman on was not on the nature of the expression used, but because he was entering into a matter which is really one of debate, and which could not properly be raised at Question time. That is the reason why I did not call upon him to withdraw.

Sir FORTESCUE FLANNERY (Yorkshire, Shipley): On the point of order arising out of your ruling with regard to the Question of the hon. Member for North Monmouth, I wish to ask whether there is no regulation of this House restraining hon. Members from making, under the guise of Questions, insinuations which they do not support by evidence or even by direct assertion.

***Mr. SPEAKER**: I have dealt with the whole matter, and I cannot allow it to be again raised.

Mr. McKenna rose amid Ministerial cries of "Order."

***Mr. SPEAKER**: I would add that, on the face of it, after reading the Question on the Paper, I did not see that it necessarily contained a charge against any particular person.

Mr. McKENNA: May I say a word ——[Ministerial cries of "No."]

***Mr. SPEAKER**: If it is on the point of order I may tell the hon. Member that I have already dealt with it.

[The incident then closed.]

Trades Union and Trades Disputes Bill.

Mr. SHACKLETON (Lancashire, Clitheroe): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, seeing that the House has agreed to the Second Reading of the Trades Union and Trades Disputes Bill, and considering the feeling in the country in favour of the Bill, he will give facilities for its further consideration by this House with a view to its becoming law this session.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Gentleman is probably aware of the answer I have given this session, and in many preceding sessions, when privileges are asked for for private Bills. It would be impossible, I believe, to make an exception in favour of one Bill without creating an amount of difficulty and friction which no Leader of the House would willingly be responsible for. And I may add that, as far as I can forecast the course of public business, the Bills for which the Government are responsible are likely to occupy the whole time of the House up to the usual time of our rising.

Transvaal Labour Ordinance.

MAJOR SEELY (Isle of Wight): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in view of the pledge given by His Majesty's Government that in the matter of Asiatic labour the Transvaal shall be treated as though it were a self-governing colony, and in view of the fact that the census recently taken in that colony renders the taking of a vote on the matter possible and easy, he will direct that such vote be taken before permitting any importation of Asiatic labour, in order to decide the question whether there is a majority of the inhabitants of that colony in favour of such importation.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have really nothing to add to the answer given, I think, on 16th February,† by my right hon. friend the Secretary of State for the Colonies. It is quite true that since that date a census has been taken; but the mere fact that a census has been taken will not provide the machinery by which a plebiscite could be obtained, and the Government, in these circumstances, see no reason to depart from the policy already announced.

The Rand Mines.

MAJOR SEELY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies a Question of which I have given private notice—namely, whether his attention has been called to the statement as to the ill-treatment of natives on the Rand mines as disclosed in the Blue-book, "Cape of Good Hope, 9.4., 1904" recently presented to the Cape Parliament, and what action he proposes to take in the matter.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. LYTTELTON, Warwick and Leamington): I communicated with Lord Milner some time ago in regard to the statements made in the Report to which the hon. Member refers, and the Papers which I am laying directly will contain full information as to the action of the Transvaal Native Department in safeguarding the interests of native labourers. Mr. Brownlee's Report in the Cape Parliamentary Papers contains certain criticisms which received immediate attention; but he states that he gathered that on the whole their treatment is good, and that the mine-owners and compound managers are anxious to make the treatment and condition of the native labourers as congenial to them as possible.

ADJOURNMENT.

Major SEELY rose in his place and asked leave to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, viz.:—"The cruel and improper treatment of South African Natives employed on the Witwatersrand Mines, as disclosed by the Report of Delegates and Correspondence relating thereto contained in the Blue-book, G. 4, 1904, lately presented to both Houses of Parliament at the Cape of Good Hope by command of His Excellency the Governor"; but the pleasure of the House not having been signified,

*MR. SPEAKER called on those Members who supported the Motion to rise in their places, and not less than forty Members having accordingly risen, the Motion stood over, under Standing Order No. 10, until this Evening's Sitting.

NEW BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (SCOTLAND) BILL.

"To make further provision for Local Government in Scotland; and for other purposes," presented by Mr. Maxwell; supported by Mr. Ure, Mr. Hozier, Dr. Farquharson, Sir Charles Renshaw, and Mr. Dewar; to be read a second time upon Monday, 16th May, and to be printed. [Bill 181.]

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxix., 1545.

SUPPLY [8TH ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1904–5.

CLASS II.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £10,495, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Office of His Majesty's Secretary for Scotland and Subordinate Office, Expenses under The Inebriates Acts, 1879 to 1900, and Expenses under The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, including a Grant in Aid of the Congested Districts (Scotland) Fund."

*MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland) said he desired to draw attention——

*MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty), on a point of order, said that, on the previous night, he gave notice of his intention to move a reduction of Item A, and it appeared in due course in the Blue Papers that morning, but it was not to be found on the Orders of the Day. He did not know why that was so, but he asked whether he was not entitled to raise his Motion before the hon. Member for Orkney and Shetland spoke.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member will have an opportunity of doing so later on, and I will take care that no other hon. Member moves a reduction of any item lower than the one which the hon. Member wishes to discuss.

*MR. WEIR: Why does not my notice appear on the Orders of the Day?

*THE CHAIRMAN: I understand it is a printer's error. The hon. Member will not be injuriously affected thereby.

*MR. CATHCART WASON said he wished particularly to refer to the Report of the Secretary for Scotland on the work of the Congested Districts Board. He spoke from his own knowledge of the admirable manner in which that Board had conducted its business in the far North, and he desired to note with cordial approval the fact that the Secretary for Scotland had intimated that he was prepared to consider the question of an extension of the powers of the Board, especially in regard to loans. One of their principal troubles in the North was in connection with the herring fleets, which went out to sea and were often becalmed and unable to get back with their catches. Now, it was desirable to provide the fleets with some means of transport, and if money could be advanced to enable the provision of motor power, it would be an enormous advantage. He trusted that the right hon. Gentleman would take that matter into his consideration. He also hoped that steps would be taken to establish a training ship off that part of the coast of Scotland. He was quite prepared to oppose any unfair criticism in regard to the work of the Board, because most admirable work had been done, particularly in Orkney and Shetland, in providing piers, and in carrying out other undertakings of which the people could not otherwise have had the advantage. He could not agree with the hon. Member for East Lanarkshire that the Congested Districts Board should confine its operations to buying land. That was only a small part of its work. Its main object should be to make the lives of the people pleasant and comfortable, and to encourage trade and commerce. The Board had also done good work in the direction of supplying poor districts with seed, and he wished to take tha opportunity of tendering his personal thanks to the right hon. Gentleman and his predecessor for having rather strained the letter of the law in supplying a very poor district with seed at a time when it was in great need of it. There were many other ways in which the Board had assisted the poorer districts in the North of Scotland, and, speaking for Members representing congested districts in the North, he would say that the last thing they would like would be to take advantage of the liberality, industry, and intelligence which the Board had brought to bear upon Scottish affairs. They would not encourage any attempt to get at the Board, or to obtain money from it on unfair pretences.

He did not wish to unduly occupy the time of the Committee, but there was one matter of somewhat personal significance to which he must refer. A considerable number of years ago there was a road very much wanted in a certain district in Orkney. At that time an election was proceeding and the proprietor of that part of the island informed the people that if they would vote for a certain individual (for his humble self in fact) he would do his utmost to facilitate the construction of the road. Well he (the speaker) had the good fortune to be returned to that House, partly by the votes of those people, but nothing whatever was done to construct the road, although he himself did his best by pointing out the necessity for it to the Congested Districts Board. The people in the constituency naturally observed, "It's all right for you, you are in Parliament, but we have not got our road." Later the matter cropped up in the Orkney County Council, and then there was the mysterious disappearance of a certain letter addressed to the Congested Districts Board. Time went on and another election occurred in that particular district. Again the proprietor of that small village gave a pledge to the people that if they would vote in a certain direction (this time against himself instead of for him) they would get the road. Well, he was elected, and still no road had been made, with the result that the residents of this little hamlet, numbering probably eighty or ninety souls, were absolutely cut off from the rest of the world and could only get supplies or send away the products of their industry by carrying them on their backs. He was not blaming the Congested Districts Board for this, but he did think that the people had been very badly treated, and he hoped the Board would do its utmost to enforce the completion of a bargain which was distinctly entered into between the proprietor of the district and the public. A great injustice had been undoubtedly done, and for purely selfish and unjust reasons the Congested Districts Board had been utilised and its name bandied about in a most offensive manner in connection with the matter, while the people had not got the road, and it did not seem as if they were likely to get it. Public feeling had been so aroused that the Congested Districts Board had sent an officer to report upon some other road which had been brought to public notice for the first time. He had felt it his duty to bring before the notice of the Board the undesirability of sending down an officer who was, and had been, a partisan of the landlord and the proprietor of the island. He hoped the representations he had made would have due effect, and that the right hon. Gentleman would secure an independent report from the island.

Another matter to which he desired to call attention had reference to a process carried out by certain Norwegians who had been driven from their own country by Act of Parliament and the pressure of public opinion. These men had come down and settled in Shetland. Their practice was to send out a boat, armed with an enormous harpoon, and then, when they captured a whale, to drag it into the shore, cut off two or three inches of blubber, tow the carcase out to sea, and leave it. The result was that the bodies floated back to the shore, and there remained. Not only did the carcases pollute the atmosphere, but they had destroyed the mussel-beds, and reduced the poor fishing folk to the verge of despair. A gentleman had been sent down to report on the matter, and doubtless his report would carry due weight. He had no desire to criticise that report; what he wished to refer to was a letter sent by this official to one of the promoters of this process, in which the promoter was assured that he would doubtless have to face a certain amount of jealous and ignorant opposition, but that he had no reason to fear opposition at head quarters. This was a most improper remark for a gentleman to make who had been sent to report. He did not mind what was said about himself, but he deeply resented any reflection on his constituents, and it was a most improper action on the part of this official to attempt to prejudge the case as he had done in the letter referred to. The process was not of the slightest advantage to the country, and it was probably destroying the balance of power in nature. He remembered that years ago there was an agitation for the destruction of certain vermin, and the result was a frightful plague of mice which ruined many farmers. Something of the same sort must happen in this instance. In any case it was a serious matter, and ought to be impartially dealt with.

There was one other matter he wished to mention. In the time of the right hon. Gentleman's predecessor, the proprietor of a certain island entered into an arrangement with the Woods and Forests Department, who had jurisdiction over certain fishing, and an agreement for sale or lease was prepared. In that lease it was distinctly stated that the right of the public to fish should be arranged for by regulations approved by the Secretary for Scotland. The noble Lord who then occupied that office gave an assurance that before the regulations were finally settled the inhabitants should have an opportunity of perusing them, and making any comments they thought necessary. The people had enjoyed the privilege of the foreshore fishing from time immemorial, and all they asked was that the privilege should not be taken away simply to enable a certain individual to turn his property into a huge sporting estate. The promise to which he had referred was given three years ago, but no regulations had yet appeared. He trusted the right hon. Gentleman would use every endeavour to see that that pledge was carried out.

DR. FARQUHARSON (Aberdeenshire, W.) said that although his constituency was on the fringe of the Highlands, he joined with his hon. friend in deprecating any attack upon the emoluments of the Secretary for Scotland who had helped the Congested Districts Board to do admirable work in developing the resources of the Highlands. In previous years the complaint had been that this Board never spent all the money at its disposal, but it had now spent all its money and had incurred various liabilities, which would probably prevent it carrying on effectively its system of land purchase. He hardly thought there was any necessity for bringing compulsion to bear upon landlords in the Highlands, because as a rule they were only too willing to sell their land and get rid of the great expense of maintaining it. If the representatives of the Congested Districts Board would come up to Aberdeenshire and cast a friendly eye on some property he had there, he would give them a most friendly reception, and they might negotiate for the purchase of some land there which he had considerable difficulty with at the present moment. In Aberdeenshire they had not much land which was suitable pasture for cattle or sheep, but they were an enterprising patient people who were fully entitled to some recognition from the State. The crofters deserved all they got, for they had suffered for a long period, and had not been well treated in the past, but under the Crofters Act they had developed themselves in a most extraordinary way. They had become, according to one report, "entirely new men," and their condition was quite as good as the Irish peasant who had bought his own land. It had been shown that when these crofters got the opportunity they ceased to be lazy, and they could not expect a man to be industrious if he had nothing to be industrious upon. In the North of Scotland they were looking with envious eyes upon what was being done in the Highlands for the people there. That improvement had been brought about by the agitation of hon. Members representing the Highlands. No great reform had ever been accomplished without continual pressure upon Parliament by bringing before the House and the Minister responsible the grievances of the constituencies. This had been done in a continuous and persistent way by hon. Members representing the Highlands, and he admired their action. He was glad to notice that the Bill which had been introduced by the Secretary for Scotland gave larger powers to the Congested Districts Board. They wanted powers to deal with technical education and to go in for agricultural education and better sanitation.

*THE CHAIRMAN: Order, order! The hon. Member is not entitled to discuss Bills on this Vote, and legislation cannot be debated now.

DR. FARQUHARSON said the great difficulty was to make people realise that the great aim of the Congested Districts Board was not to give them assistance for a time, but to teach them how they could best help themselves. He thought Lady Gordon Cathcart was entitled to have brought before the notice of the House the excellent work she had done in trying to develop the resources of the Highlands. She had written a letter which anticipated the action of the Congested Districts Board, she had placed on record the good work she had done, and she complained of the want of sympathy shown by those she was trying to aid. He thought she was a little disappointed that her excellent work had not been more successful in developing the resources of the Highlands, and she laid stress upon some very important points. To begin with, she had done some excellent work in trying to develop fishing in those parts. Those poor people could not live by agricultural land alone, and it was impossible to live on a farm of less than thirty acres and keep a family; the only chance they had of obtaining a livelihood was by doing a little farming and something else. All he was anxious about was that Lady Gordon Cathcart should have full credit for what she had done. She had established harbours, built boats and hotels, and brought forward many good propositions. He thought the men in these districts should be enabled to do one of two things. They should either become small farmers with thirty, forty, or fifty acres to cultivate and live upon, or they should become crofters who, in addition to having a portion of land to cultivate, should be able to carry on the occupation of fishing. What was of importance was that a little money should be given to provide good centres from which they could carry on the fishing industry with some probability that they would do so with advantage. Lady Gordon Cathcart had laid down conditions that boys at the public schools were to be taught trades, and that the girls were to be taught domestic economy—cooking and a variety of subjects which would make them good housewives. Finally, it was a portion of the scheme that the surplus population should be settled on land more suitable for cultivation and in districts where employment could be found. There had been a good deal of talk lately about the physical condition of school children of the poorer classes, and the desirability of providing food for them. He asked the Secretary for Scotland whether it came within the purview of the new arrangement to be made under the Scotch Education Bill to provide meals once or twice a day for children who required food in order to fit them for the performance of their school work.

The SECRETARY for SCOTLAND (Mr. A. Graham Murray, Buteshire) was understood to say that the Question was not in order in connection with the Vote now before the Committee.

Dr. FARQUHARSON said he would not pursue the question farther. He found that he was treading on delicate ground.

*Mr. WEIR said he had the fullest sympathy with the people of the township referred to by the hon. Member for Orkney and Shetland. The hon. Member's constituents appeared to be suffering from dead whales. The constituency he himself represented suffered from live deer. He could only hope that steps would be taken to remedy the grievance his hon. friend complained of. What did the hon. Member know about Ross and Cromarty? His constituents sent him to Parliament because they had confidence in him, and in attending to their interests he did not proceed by agitation as the hon. Member for Aberdeenshire had suggested. It might be better if he could agitate, but he was afraid he was weak in that respect. His hon. friend said that no compulsion was necessary in regard to the acquisition of land for the people. He would deal with that question at a later stage. His hon. friend had spoken in high terms of Lady Gordon Cathcart. If she possessed all the good qualities with which the hon. Member credited her, he wished there were half-a-dozen ladies of her sort in certain congested parts of the counties he represented. He moved that Item A be reduced by £100. The Vote included salaries from that of the Secretary for Scotland down to that of the humblest charwoman. He admired the Secretary for Scotland for having thrown up a post worth £5,000 to take one at £2,000. Of course the right hon. Gentleman had the honour and glory of being Secretary for Scotland. That was something, and to a rich man what was the loss of £3,000 a year? If he had his way, the Secretary for Scotland would have £5,000 still. There was plenty of work in Scotland for him.

He had a bone, however, to pick with the right hon. Gentleman, in fact more than one. Some time ago he asked for a Deer Forest Return, and the right hon. Gentleman stated that it would be somewhat troublesome to prepare, or that he did not see any occasion for such a Return. He saw very great occasion for such a Return. The predecessor of the right hon. Gentleman was good enough to grant a Return a few years ago. It was the most inaccurate document he ever held in his hand. He called the attention of the Secretary for Scotland to the fact that it was inaccurate. It was referred to Mr. Dundas, the Crown Agent, in Edinburgh. The errors were pointed out to that gentleman who, he supposed, was instructed to prepare another Return. That Return was duly prepared by Mr. Dundas. He was a lawyer and it might be expected that he would be careful and accurate. The previous Return was bad, but this one was no better. It was a grossly inaccurate document. It was because of these gross inaccuracies that he asked the right hon. Gentleman to arrange for another Return. He asked the right hon. Gentleman to give a pledge to-day that he would grant a Return of the deer forest acreage. If the right hon. Gentleman did not accede to that request he would find it necessary to divide the Committee on the Question, much as he disliked causing Members to trot through the Lobbies. The extension of the deer forest area was simply alarming. When he brought the fact before the First Lord of the Treasury some time ago, the right hon. Gentleman replied that he had no official information as to the state of matters. What more information did he need? The representatives of Highland constituencies were informed from time to time that large grazing farms were being added to the deer forest area. In 1883 the deer forest area was 1,711,802 acres, and in 1898 it had increased to 2,287,296 acres. That was an increase of 33 per cent. in fifteen years. Reference had been made to the document prepared by Lord Balfour of Burleigh, entitled, "The Social Condition of the Island of Lewis." He would always feel grateful to the noble Lord for visiting the island and giving that most valuable report. What the Committee should realise was that even in the Island of Lewis the Deer Forest Commission scheduled fifteen places suitable for new holdings, consisting of 1,618 acres old arable and 34,516 acres pasture, and for the extension of holding 665 acres old arable and 65,025 acres pasture.

*The CHAIRMAN: I do not see how this matter can arise on this Vote.

*Mr. WEIR said he knew the Secretary for Scotland had power to grant a Return as to the acreage under deer forests.

*The CHAIRMAN: As long as the hon. Gentleman sticks to that point he is in order, but not otherwise.

*Mr. WEIR said that there was a greater need now than ever for an accurate Return of the area of the Highlands under deer. The last Return was grossly inaccurate. He would suggest also that if the right hon. Gentleman made up his mind to grant that Return he should employ competent men, not lawyers who knew absolutely nothing about the matter, to prepare it. What a farce it was to ask landlords and their factors to supply that information. The right hon. Gentleman ought to employ competent assessors to go round and find out the actual acreage under deer forests. Another matter to which he wished to draw attention came partly under the Board of Trade and partly under the Scotch Office. Some time ago the head of the Scotch Office informed him that in consequence of the heavy charges which were made for conveying fish and agricultural produce from the Highlands to the great centres of population, he would use his influence with the railway companies to try and bring about a better state of things. He was sure that the right hon. Gentleman must desire to increase trade in the Highlands and enable the people to get their produce to market. Had he made any effort in that direction? The railway companies made some concession to the steamship company which ran vessels between Stornoway and Mallaig; but that was not enough, and indeed the charges had been increased to the senders of fish and agricultural produce, the result being disastrous to traders. He trusted the right hon. Gentleman would try and secure lower transit rates for the produce of these northern parts to the great centres of population. Then there was the question of the Moray Forth. Would not the Secretary for Scotland approach the Foreign Office with a view to get the signatories to the North Sea Fisheries Convention——

*THE CHAIRMAN: That matter does not arise on this Vote. If the hon. Member will look at Class IV., Vote 6, Item F, he will see that there is a Vote for the North Sea Investigation.

*MR. WEIR said that that was a scientific investigation, which was a totally different thing. It referred to the Hydrographical Conference which, amongst other things, dealt with the temperature of the water off the coasts of Scotland, Norway, and elsewhere. But the right hon. Gentleman had the power to go to the Foreign Office, and endeavour to bring about some arrangement with Foreign Governments to get rid of the marauding foreign trawlers in the Moray Firth.

*THE CHAIRMAN: That cannot be raised on this Vote. If there is any question of an arrangement with Foreign Powers it must be raised on the Foreign Office Vote.

*MR. WEIR said that surely the Scottish Office had the power to bring under the notice of the Foreign Office some means of getting rid of the foreign trawlers in the Moray Firth. At any rate, he asked the right hon. Gentleman to do something in the matter. It lay with the Scottish Office to take the initiative. He now came to the question of the consulting engineer to the Scottish Office whose salary was on this Vote. That gentleman was a retired Army officer with an Army pension of £450 a year and his full salary was subject to a reduction of 10 per cent. in that respect. He had been now a great many years consulting engineer to the Scottish Office and should retire at the age of sixty-five. Colonel Gore-Booth must surely have passed the retiring age or must be nearing it. The other night a Member of the House said that Colonel Gore-Booth was an extremely amiable and pleasant gentleman; but that was not enough. What was wanted was efficiency. He contended that the gentleman had not done his work satisfactorily. There was the question of the road between Gravir and Cromore in the Island of Lewis. The local surveyor, who knew every inch of the ground, sketched out a plan for an economical road. Colonel Gore-Booth, or his deputy, came down and inspected the district, and said there must be a road according to his plan, with the result that the road would cost a large additional sum of money. The people of the neighbourhood were told that they must provide that extra money. The Secretary for Scotland knew that that was one of the poorest districts in the Island of Lewis and that it was utterly impossible for the people to provide the money. They offered to give so much labour free to make the road. Colonel Gore-Booth would not budge. This case was most unsatisfactory. Several thousands of the population had had to pay road rates for years and had not a single inch of road. He only wished the right hon. Gentleman would follow the example of Lord Balfour of Burleigh. The summer days were coming on, and the right hon. Gentleman would enjoy a run down to the interesting island of Lewis, where he could see for himself the state of affairs. The right hon. Gentleman would learn far more by one hour's inspection on the spot than in twenty years from the reports of gentlemen who sat in their arm-chairs in Edinburgh. Some heed should be given to the opinion of local men. He asked the right hon. Gentleman again to submit this matter to Colonel Gore-Booth. He found that a sum of 100 guineas was paid to Colonel Gore-Booth as travelling expenses. He himself drove through his constituency in a carriage and pair, but it did not cost him anything approaching that amount. He hoped the Secretary for Scotland would look into the various matters he had mentioned, and that a Return of an adequate character with reference to deer forests in Scotland would be prepared.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item A (Salaries) be reduced by £100."—(*Mr. Weir.*)

MR. ASHER (Elgin Burghs) said he wished to refer to the practice which had recently been established of capturing whales off the coasts of Orkney and Shetland. The matter was certainly very peculiar, and its history very instructive. The practice of hunting whales off the coast of Norway was found to be highly destructive to ordinary fishing, and the consequence was that the Norwegian Government passed an Act prohibiting its subjects from capturing whales during the fishing season. The result was that the Norwegian fishermen migrated to Orkney and Shetland and pursued their calling there; and precisely the same mischief that was caused off the coast of Norway was now being caused off the coasts of Orkney and Shetland. His hon. friend for Orkney and Shetland referred to the matter chiefly from the point of view of the nuisance which was caused on the coast after the blubber had been removed from the whales. His point was that the fishermen from the East coast of Scotland who migrated to Orkney and Shetland for the herring season found the practice to be most destructive. It was quite impossible for whale hunting and herring fishing to be carried on simultaneously in the same waters. He had been the medium of transmitting to the Secretary for Scotland a petition signed by about 500 of the chief fishermen and fish curers on the East coast of Scotland, asking for the right hon. Gentleman's intervention; and he desired to express his acknowledgment of the courtesy of the right hon. Gentleman in immediately taking the matter in hand. He understood that the right hon. Gentleman was making inquiries on the subject; and he would be indebted to him if he would state what progress had been made and what the prospects were. He would appeal to the right hon. Gentleman to take two steps. The persons who were prosecuting whale hunting found it necessary to have stations on shore, and they had applied to the Board of Trade for permission to erect them. He would ask the right hon. Gentleman to get his Department to intervene and to exercise the power which they no doubt possessed to prevent that permission being granted until the matter had been fully investigated. He did not ask the right hon. Gentleman to accept the statements in the petition with regard to the extremely injurious effect of whale fishing; but he hoped the matter would be kept open until it was thoroughly investigated. No doubt whale fishing was important to the persons engaged in it; but it could not be compared in importance with the great herring and white fishing industries off the coast of Orkney and Shetland. If the right hon. Gentleman intervened the result would be that the applications for permission to erect stations would be suspended; and his conviction was that if they were suspended until a proper inquiry was held they would ultimately be refused altogether. He would further suggest to the right hon. Gentleman that having regard to the great importance of the matter he should appoint a Departmental Committee for the purpose of ascertaining whether whale hunting was not absolutely inconsistent with the successful prosecution of the herring and white fishing industries off the coast of Orkney and Shetland. That Commission might consist of a representative of the Scottish Office, a representative of the Board of Trade, and probably a member of the Local Government Board or the Scottish Fishery Board. If they were sent down as a special Commission to investigate the matter on the spot they would get accurate information, and the Scottish Office would then be in a position to deal with the matter in an authoritative manner. He could assure the right hon. Gentleman it was a very important matter; and that a *prima facie* case existed in favour of the facts set forth in the petition. The Scottish fishermen were satisfied that their interests were being interferred with and the result was that they were actively agitating in support of the steps he had mentioned.

*Captain ELLICE (St. Andrews Burghs) said he wished to associate himself with what his hon. friend had just said on the subject of whale hunting. He understood from the fishermen on the East coast of Fife that this question of whale fishing very seriously affected their interests, while they were away at the summer herring fishing in the Shetlands. He knew that some of the fishermen from his own constituency had been poisoned by the masses of putrid blubber floating about in the harbours there. One point had not been mentioned as yet in the debate, namely, that the whales, in some instances, acted as sheep dogs do in herding sheep, and kept the herrings close shoaled. The fishermen were able to locate the herrings, and the catch was improved.

*Mr. HARMSWORTH (Caithness-shire) desired in as few words as possible to support his hon. friend. It was in his opinion a matter of national importance that there should be a *bona-fide* statement showing the growth of the deer forest acreage in the North of Scotland. He himself believed that the deplorable state of the Highlands of Scotland was mainly due to so much of the country being given over to deer forests. He also entirely agreed with all that had been said with regard to the effect of whaling upon the herring fisheries, and he trusted the right hon. Gentleman would see his way to refuse permission for the establishment of the stations in the Shetlands.

Mr. URE (Linlithgowshire) called attention to the want of accommodation in the Courts of Scotland. There had been a good deal of delay in the Scottish Office in the matter of enlarging the Courts, a question which had been before the country for a century. The Scottish Office obtained plans of the proposed enlargements as far back as 1881, but since that date nothing whatever had been done. The ground which was to be used for the purpose was still vacant but nothing had been done by the right hon. Gentleman or his predecessors to secure the funds necessary for the work. It was not so much the Judges or barristers practising in the Courts who were inconvenienced but the litigants and the general public. There was no complaint as to the condition of the Appeal Courts and those Courts where criminal cases were tried, but the condition of the Courts where the ordinary business of the country was conducted, the Courts of First Instance, was deplorable. The accommodation for the Bar was limited as was also that of the official reporters, while the accommodation for the general public, solicitors, litigants, and others was cribbed, cabined, and confined to a degree not creditable to Scotland as a progressive country. Since 1868 a great change had come over the administration of justice in Scotland, and many more people frequented the Courts than formerly. They suffered considerably from the want of suitable accommodation for witnesses, and very often there was extreme difficulty in finding a witness although no complaint could be made of the attempts of the attendants to find them. All these things urgently called for reform, and all that was required was money.

*The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the subject the hon. Gentleman appeared to be raising was that of buildings and that would not be in order on this Vote.

*Mr. MACONOCHIE (Aberdeenshire, E.) said, with reference to the complaint which had been made as to the whales off the coast of Scotland, the advantage of these whales to Norway was that they drove the shoals of herrings into the fiords and enabled the Norwegian fishermen to secure their catches at the lowest cost. Scottish fishermen would like to see these whales destroyed because they did harm to the shoals in the open sea by driving them about and separating the fish and preventing Scottish fishermen getting decent catches. The fishermen on the East coast of Scotland complained that after the Norwegians had filched all the blubber from a whale they towed the carcase out to sea, and left it—a danger to the nets and boats of all those who fished those waters. There was no doubt that the district referred to by the hon. Member for Ross-shire was a poor one, and the hon. Member in pressing his case would have strengthened his argument if he had given a few descriptions of what existed in the Highlands and Islands of Scotland. But the only way to improve these parts would be to offer some practical suggestion either with regard to the fleet or the improvement of the fishermen.

*MR. AINSWORTH (Argyllshire) said there were special reasons why the information in the suggested Deer-forest Return should be up-to-date. Sheep valuations had recently brought about a great extension of deer forests, and the same question was having a damaging effect, not only on agriculture, but also on population. He knew a case in which a few months ago several thousands of acres of land, eminently suited for sheep but unsuited for deer, were put under deer owing to the difficulty caused by this question of valuation. The matter being so important, he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would give all the information at his disposal, and if possible let the Return include not only the acreage under deer, but also the annual value as sheep-farm and deer-forest. Another matter in which the Highlands were deeply interested was the carriage of fish. In view of the fact that some of the railways were assisted by Government money advanced at low rates of interest, he thought the authorities were entitled to see that the public were granted the most favourable rates possible.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY said he had no control whatever over the question of railway rates. That was a matter with which the Board of Trade had to deal. The question of whales was interesting from a natural history point of view, and it was also novel. He would not discuss whether it was an industry or a process, but it was certainly something in which a considerable amount of capital was involved. Quite recently plant to the value of £6,000 or £8,000 had been landed, and a pier applied for. Such an application would obviously not be made unless the promoters were confident they could secure a good return from the craft. The particular kind of whale concerned was new as an article of pursuit, as it was not the small whale that had often been caught by the inhabitants of the hon. Member's constituency. He was fully aware of the apprehension which had been aroused and of the inconvenience caused by the manner in which the craft was prosecuted, and from the point of view of what could legally be done the matter could be looked at in three aspects. First, there was the question of public health as affected by these carcases being left off the shore in a more or less disagreeable condition; secondly, there was the fisheries question; and thirdly, there was the question of how far the Board of Trade should veto the carrying on of the industry by refusing the use of the foreshore and preventing the construction of the proposed pier. As far as the public health was concerned, the business as carried on was an intolerable nuisance, and steps had been taken to bring that to an end by placing the process in the category of offensive trades and instructing the local medical officers to enforce the law. As a matter of fact, the companies had expressed their preparedness to erect plant which would consume the whole carcase, and that, if done, would get over the public health objection. As far as the Board of Trade were concerned, all that could be doen was to ask them to hold their hand until a little more was known about the subject, and whatever influence he had would be used in that direction. There remained then the fishing aspect of the question. The fact that when they began to deal with the habits of fish they went beyond the limits of exact knowledge was well illustrated by the divergent views expressed by the hon. Member for East Aberdeenshire and the hon. Member for St. Andrews, one of whom contended that the whale acted as a sort of pursuer, scattering the fish right and left, while the other held that the whale fulfilled the part of a sheep-dog, driving the fish into a compact body and enabling the fishermen to get a full catch. Both of those views were interesting, but they could not both be correct. The question was complicated by the consideration that the Government could not prevent Norwegian subjects killing whales in any way they chose so long as they did it beyond the territorial limit. Probably the only method would be by indirect compulsion. Beyond all doubt a very real interest was taken in the matter in Scotland, and it was only right that the people should be satisfied as far as possible. He was, therefore, prepared to assent to the suggestion that an inquiry should be instituted. Without pledging himself as to the exact form of the inquiry, he would undertake to have an investigation made, so that they might, as far as possible, see how the matter stood, and he would be prepared to act upon the results of that inquiry, if necessary.

He did not intend to go into the question of deer forests at length. The contention that the deplorable state of the Highlands was mainly due to the deer forests was an utterly unsound proposition which could never stand the test of actual inquiry. He agreed, however, that the unfortunate practice which had grown up in connection with sheep valuation had much to do with the change from sheep farms to deer forest. There appeared to be a little misapprehension about the Return. A Return was granted from year to year with regard to deer forests, of which the hon. Member for Ross-shire complained as being inaccurate. Nobody contended that it was precisely accurate in regard to acreage. The only way in which the Return could be prepared was by taking such information as the assessors could give, and the assessors derived their knowledge from the factors who sent in returns. The hon. Member had pressed for an absolutely accurate Return. An actual survey would be necessary for such a purpose, and the expense would be altogether incommensurate with the value of the Return. He was perfectly willing to give the old Return based upon the best class of evidence one could get through the assessors, but he was not agreeable to grant a Return under which he would be bound to give an acreage column guaranteed to be absolutely correct. He did not know whether that would satisfy the hon. Member for Ross-shire, or whether he would insist upon going to a division. The idea of having an accurate survey laying down the exact acreage under deer forests could not be justified.

*MR. WEIR said it was all very well for hon. Members who had no deer forests in their constituencies to shout out "Hear, hear." Let the deer live and flourish, but they ought to be sent up to their proper place on the hills, and they should not be allowed to live upon land which might be otherwise occupied by human beings. There was plenty of room for the deer, but what he objected to was that human beings should be cleared out and fertile land set aside for deer forests which had been scheduled as suitable for the people and yet was not devoted to the purpose. The result was that the country had to suffer. The right hon. Gentleman said there was only a small amount of suitable land, but he would remind him that there were tens of thousands of acres in his own constituency.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: I did not say anything about there being only a small amount of land available. What I said was that as far as the employment of the people is concerned there are more people employed on the land under deer forests than when the land is devoted to sheep farming.

*MR. WEIR said that the right hon. Gentleman could get the survey asked for from the Board of Agriculture, who had all the information if the right hon. Gentleman would only take the trouble to secure it. The Secretary for Scotland had stated that he was willing to grant the Return, but not on the lines he had asked for. They never could get all they wanted at once and they had to go stage by stage. He was willing to accept the Return as promised, but if it turned out to be inaccurate, as it was last time, he should continue to try and get an accurate Return of the deer forest acreage. On those conditions he would accept the Return and leave himself free if necessary to renew his efforts to obtain an accurate Return. He begged leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Original Question again proposed.

MR. MUNRO FERGUSON (Leith Burghs) congratulated the right hon. Gentleman on the value of the first Report issued under his auspices by the Congested Districts Board. The work of the Board had very often been complained of in the past, and its efforts had been very disappointing. Scotch Members had often contended that the work of the Congested Districts Board would not be effective until it was given compulsory powers. It would be noticed in the Report that the Board itself asked for additional powers. He had always attached great importance to the work of the Congested Districts Board in dealing with land, and he was glad to see that during the past year it had for the first time been able to acquire land upon a considerable scale. The hon. Member for Shetland had praised the work of the Board in other respects and the Board could now supply everything, including lights, roads, landing-places, fences, telegraphs, seed potatoes, stallions, bees, hens, and cocks. The land question was not the same in the North as in the West of Scotland, and he would like to ask the right hon. Gentleman to consider whether it would not be possible to combine the powers of the Congested Districts Board and the Crofters Commission with respect to the management of the land. He thought if that were done it would be a much more efficient authority. The work of the Congested Districts Board with respect to the purchase and utilisation of land had been much criticised in the past. The Crofters Commission had had to deal with much greater difficulties and they had met with a success which nobody disputed. The Crofters Act was based upon a foundation which might be a little difficult to justify in law. However much one might be inclined to doubt it as a permanent arrangement, it had been a great success in the Highlands, and the Crofters Commission had done its work in a manner which had commanded the confidence of everybody, whether landlord or tenant. He should, therefore, like to see the work of the Congested Districts Board as regards land put under the Crofters Commission. So long as these two bodies were working separately the work not only overlapped to some extent, but it overlapped with a considerable number of other bodies who controlled the matters he had just enumerated. If they gave to the Crofters Commission the power possessed by the Congested Districts Board for acquiring land they would have a body which would meet any difficulties that might arise in future as to land in the Highlands with the greatest possible effect. It would be extremely desirable to have the administration put as soon as possible on a permanent footing. Another reason why it would be desirable to have one authority was that small holdings could only succeed when they were worked co-operatively in sending to market. Small holders could not compete with large ones unless they adopted the co-operative system. It would be more easy for one authority to effectively grapple with co-operation than was possible under a dual arrangement. The success of this system under the Irish Congested Districts Board had been so marked that it was hoped much greater prosperity might be brought to small holders in the Highlands by more efficient provision for co-operation than existed at present. He asked the Secretary for Scotland to consider whether, if he could not have one land authority in the Highlands, he could not have a clear definition of the functions and spheres of such bodies as the Crofters Commission, the Congested Districts Board, and the other local authorities concerned? He was satisfied that there were portions of deer forests which might be made available for occupation and it was for that reason that he thought compulsory powers were most required.

*MR. JOHN DEWAR (Inverness) said he was afraid that Highland questions were treated rather lightly in this House. He could assure the Committee that there was a great deal of congestion, poverty, and distress in many parts of the Highlands and it was because he did not believe that the Congested Districts Board was properly doing the work it was created to do that he asked the Committee to reduce the amount of this Vote by £100. The Report presented the other day had a strong family resemblance to previous Reports. There was not very much new, and very little had been done in respect of most of the objects for which the Board was created. He heartily congratulated the Secretary for Scotland on the large purchase of land that had been made in Skye, at a cost of £95,000. He did not think the Board could have discovered any land better suited for an experiment in regard to the settlement of crofters. He hoped they would select as manager of this new venture a man who was in sympathy with the crofter movement, and that the crofts would be of sufficient size to employ a man and his family and give them a decent living. He supported the suggestion of the hon. Member for the Leith Burghs that the co-operative movement among the crofters should be encouraged. The Board seemed to take the view that before they purchased land they must accumulate the money necessary to pay for it. He desired to point out that they had power to borrow on the value of the land, and it would be very disappointing if they had to wait years before another purchase was made by the Board. He should like to point out what had been done in Ireland. During the thirteen years since 1901 the Irish Congested Districts Board, with a revenue of under £100,000, had spent £1,500,000. They had bought nearly £500,000 worth of land, and had spent money freely in other directions. They had, of course, borrowed money for the purpose, but if the Irish Board could do that, the Scotch Board ought at least to follow in its footsteps. He was pleased that there were indications that the landlords of Scotland were now more disposed to have crofters on the land than they used to be. He thought that the landlords had had their eyes opened to the fact that there were some advantages in having men rather than deer or sheep on the farms. In his own constituency there were one or two proprietors doing admirable work in cutting up large sheep farms. Mr. Macdonald, in Skye, was cutting up a large sheep farm and converting it into crofters' holdings. Mr. Macdonald was a distinguished officer in a company of Scouts, and he saw that if we were to have the very best class of soldiers we must make provision for their getting a settlement on the land.

The Congested Districts Board this year was not issuing any seed. He quite approved of the policy of not giving the crofters the impression that it was the business of the Board to supply them with seed, but he believed this was about one of the worst seasons that could have been chosen to stop supplying seed. The harvest last year was a very bad one, and in the West of Scotland there would be very little suitable seed available. Clause 3 of the Report indicated that the Congested Districts Board, except in exceptional circumstances, refused to grant a supply of seed. He knew, as a matter of fact, that the Board had refused or neglected to supply potato seed to tenants on their own property and that the land was consequently unproductive. He did not intend to deal so much with what was in the Report, as with what was not in it He wished to contrast the work which had been done by the Scotch and that done by the Irish Congested Districts Board The position of the population in the two districts was not dissimilar. The people were of the same race, and lived under the same social conditions; and he was bound to say that there was more poverty and distress in some parts of Inverness-shire than in many parts of Ireland. The Irish Congested Districts Board acted with some judgment in regard to their work. The Irish Report was full of what had been done for the improvement of the social condition of the people; among other things they organised parish committees to assist and keep them, but it had never occurred, seemingly, to the Scotch Board to do that. The Irish Board through those parish committees gave grants to build byres and outhouses; but nothing of the kind had been done by the Scotch Board. It seemed to him that the Scotch Board in most cases waited until they were asked to relieve some particular case, that they refused as long as ever they could to do anything, and at length when they did consent to do something they did as little as possible.

He wanted to illustrate that by one or two facts that had come to his own knowledge. A very great deal was being done in Ireland to improve the fishing industry; but in reading the Report of the Congested Districts Board he found that the Scotch fishing industry was scarcely once mentioned. Now, Scotsmen were born fishermen, and the waters of the West of Scotland were teeming with fish. The Irish knew nothing about fishing, and the Irish Congested Districts Board had positively employed Scottish fishermen to teach their fellow-countrymen how to fish. The result was that the Irish Congested Districts Board had now developed a most flourishing fishing industry. He had, over and over again, asked the Scotch Congested Districts Board to do something in this respect and to provide improved boats for the poor Scottish fishermen on the West Coast. Now-a-days, very much larger boats were needed than formerly; but the Scotch Board had done nothing in the matter. Again, he had asked the Board to provide curing stations where the fishermen might cure the fish caught by the smaller boats they at present possessed; but he was told that the Scotch Board had lifted up their hands in horror, and said that that was Socialism. Of course it was Socialism; but it was Socialism of the best kind, and was attended with the best results. The Irishmen had to be taught how to fish by Scotch crews, and the Irish Board had appointed Mr. Duthie, a Scotchman, to manage the business, and that gentleman had developed the Irish fisheries on their West Coast to the great satisfaction of the people. The Irish Board had now 180 instructors in fishing and eighty-four of these instructors were Scotch. They were not afraid of Socialism. The Irish Board had 148 boats which they lent out to fishermen and had also twenty-three fish-curing stations. To begin with, these had to be owned by the Irish Board, but it was only to enable the Irishmen to stand on their feet. And what was the result? On the Donegal and Galway coast alone the Irish Board had spent in boats and gear £18,000, and of that sum £7,700 had been repaid by the fishermen, while £3,000 had been deducted from the earnings of the crews, for their instruction. The Irish crews so instructed had earned £21,000; and the value of the fish caught last year in the area controlled by the Irish Board was over £50,000. It could be seen, therefore, what a very valuable assistance had been given to the development of the Irish fisheries by the Irish Congested Districts Board. On the fish-curing stations the Irish Board had, since 1901, spent over £38,000. Well, it did irritate Scotch Members when they found all this being done by the Irish Board, and when they were told by the Scotch Board that that was a Socialistic movement. A long time ago he lodged an application with the Scotch Congested Districts Board for a grant to enable a crew to buy a proper modern boat for £150. The crew had considerable resources of their own, and they were strongly recommended by the principal men in the island; but from that day to this he had never heard anything about his application. There must be something wrong with a Department carried on in that way. What had the Irish Board, with its Socialism, done? Last year they chartered and subsidised steamers to assist the fishermen; had actually arranged contracts between the fishermen and the fish salesmen; they subsidised Scotch boats to exploit new fishing-grounds; had purchased fish where necessary from the fishermen, cured the fish and sold it, and had actually endeavoured in one case to induce the Irish buyers to buy Irish fish. That indicated what might be done by the Scotch Congested Districts Board. Compared with what the Irish Board had done, the Scotch Board had done nothing, at any rate about fishing.

He knew that the Secretary for Scotland would say that the Fishery Board for Scotland advanced some money to West Coast fishermen which had been lost. But that was the Board's own fault. They provided the wrong boats and expended the money in the wrong way. The Irish Board had provided lucrative employment for a great many of the inhabitants of the congested districts in Ireland and had relieved their distressful condition very effectually. He knew of a small island off the West Coast of Scotland, called Eriskay, the inhabitants of which were entirely fishermen. On that coast the fishing had been very poor for the past two years and the fishermen had lost a great deal of money as well as their nets. The local priest, knowing that the mackerel and herring fishing was just coming on, applied to the Scotch Board for assistance for these fishermen to obtain new nets; and he himself had supported that application. He would like to ask at this point, Why should the local priest or local merchant or Member of Parliament have to apply to the Board? It was the duty of the Board to find out these cases and apply a remedy. He had to-day received the following letter in regard to this case which he should like to read—

> "The Congested Districts Board are to give mackerel nets only to a few boats. I sent a list of fourteen boats from Eriskay. Only three boats get nets, and of twenty-two in Uist only five get nets, and instead of giving six nets to a boat these few selected get for each boat nine pieces and all the rest none. Now, I think this is iniquitous, as the poor people were so full of expectation, now blasted completely away. Several came in their extremity to me to write to you strongly on the point. This winter was behind in supplying wreck drift ware for their land; but a good supply came lately, to which they gave their attention. Now with the wet weather they cannot get along with their tillage, which predicts a late and poor harvest; add to that no chance of fishing (what they look forward to) mackerel, and it makes the life of our unfortunate crofter fishermen a very gloomy one indeed. Can anything be done to explain the condition to the Government? In regard to herring nets for the Eriskay fishermen, will the authorities not listen to plain facts? This morning an Eriskay boat came into the Loch with four crans of herrings, the first for the season. They report good appearance, but that boat and others from Eriskay with fifteen to twenty nets in all when they ought to have at least forty. How is it possible to make headway? They have the boats, the experience and the will, I can assure you, but lack nets as I explained to you. If any accident happens, and they lose some nets they will be stranded. Now would be the time to encourage them, and not when they are totally stranded. I can recommend the Eriskay fishermen for pluck as sailors and fishermen; given the material they can fish aside anyone, and yet the Government for the Irish Vote will supply the Irish with boats, gear, and instructors, and leave the unfortunate Eriskay fishermen to their fate; and a net or two to each man (five in a boat) would be a great help. Will this be denied them when the season promises good? It shows what they can do when a native is the first to land herrings this season."

That was a genuine case which had been neglected by the Congested Districts Board. He made the suggestion that this question chould be tackled seriously and on a large scale. Let the Congested Districts Board appoint some one to give a report as to how best to meet this difficulty. There was a large population which could be relieved easily and effectually by the advance of a comparatively small sum, and if it could be done it would have the best effect. He wished to know how the persons who were given nets were selected, when all were equally deserving and necessitous. He hoped that the Congested Districts Board would carry out its work after the manner of the Irish Board. To show the scope of the work of the Irish Board, he might mention that it assisted at Foxford a factory, a Donegal tweed industry, creameries, herring barrel making, sale of thread and looms, boat building, and basket making. Altogether, the Irish Board had carried on its work in a way which the Scottish Board might well copy. It might be said that the Irish Board had more money than the Scottish Board; if they had larger resources they had very much larger, although not more acute, poverty to deal with. He did not ask the Scottish Board to spend more money. He believed the money at its disposal was ample to carry out all he asked. There must be something wrong in a Board which made so many mistakes, and he would like to know what it was. He had not any great faith in an unpaid Board; and he thought the work would be done better by a paid Board. He had over and over suggested that the Congested Districts Board should be abolished. He had no objection to the members of the Board; they were as good as could be got; but it was the inherent defects of the system which made the work of the Board inefficient. He would suggest that the work of the Board should be taken over by the Crofter Commission, which had given great satisfaction in its work. Indeed, when the Congested Districts Board wanted a report in reference to any part of the country, they usually asked the Crofter Commission to make it for them. Last year the Secretary for Scotland, who was then Lord-Advocate, stated that if the work were transferred to the Crofter Commission it would be removed from the control of Parliament; but he could not understand how, as the salaries and expenses of the Commission would have to be discussed on the Estimates. Many of the members of the Crofter Commission were members of the Congested Districts Board; and, therefore, it was not so much the Board as the system that would be changed. Something ought to be done, and would have to be done, if they were to get value for their money and if congestion was to be relieved.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item E (Congested Districts Board

(Scotland), Grant in aid) be reduced by £100."—(*Mr. John Dewar.*)

MR. LEVESON-GOWER (Sutherland) said he wished to refer to the question of the supply of seed. If ever seed were to be supplied it ought to be supplied this year, which was one of the worst years ever known in the Highlands. He observed that three parishes in Sutherland had been scheduled, whereas three parishes on the West Coast had been left out which were in a very bad way indeed. He saw with great pleasure that the Congested Districts Board was taking up the question of home industries. That would be a great advantage. The difficulty in the Highlands was that the crofts were too small, and that the crofters could not be got to remove even a small distance to larger crofts. As regarded co-operation, he quite understood the difficulty as far as selling farm produce and harvesting were concerned. He could not, however, understand any difficulty, for instance, in co-operating to have one shepherd to tend all the sheep in a township. Would not such co-operation be encouraged if the Congested Districts Board offered a prize for the best co-operative shepherding in townships in the Highlands. That might have a good effect. They had heard a good deal about the Irish Board, and very unfavourable comparisons were drawn of the Scottish Board in comparison with it. He agreed to a great extent with the hon. Member for Inverness; but yet he thought the hon. Gentleman was too hard on the Scottish Board. He wished to suggest the desirability of making a railway to the West Coast and connecting the Minch with the railway on the East Coast. If a light railway were not possible, a steam tramway might be established, which would greatly benefit the fishing industry. Although he sympathised to a great extent with what had been said by the hon. Member for Inverness in reference to the Congested Districts Board, he could not vote with him as the Board only had been in existence six years.

*MR. AINSWORTH said with regard to the question of land purchase, the small holders for whose benefit these schemes of land purchase were entered into and the money paid had no desire to become the actual owners of their holdings. What they desired to do was to go on generation after generation with the feeling that though there was a superior landlord over them, they could continue to improve their holding and could not be removed. They had no desire to become the actual owners of the land as was the case in Ireland. The idea that they desired to transfer the holding to themselves must be put aside altogether. What they desired to do was to go on as at present under a superior landlord, and wherever there was a portion of territory occupied by small holders it was desirable, and would be to the benefit of those small holders, that that territory should pass into the hands of the State, and that the tenants should in future be tenants of the State. If the Congested Districts Board had not been able to do as much as was hoped for in that direction, it must be borne in mind that they had only an income of £15,000 a year, to which a grant of £20,000 was subsequently added; and when they considered that the only body to which the Highlands and Islands could look for assistance was the Congested Districts Board, it was absurd to suppose that they could do much more than they had done with an income of only £35,000 a year. He hoped that before long they would see the Board in a much stronger position, and the money at their disposal applied as far as possible for public improvements and that their powers for the purchase and acquisition of land would be through the issue of Land-stock in a manner similar to that which had been so successful in Ireland. Wherever there was a congested district occupied by small holders, they should become tenants of the Board instead of tenants of individuals. If arrangements of this kind could be made, the Board would have much greater power to carry out improvements which hitherto they had not been able to perform, such as roads, lights, harbours, and piers, upon which the prosperity of the Highlands depended. This House, which was accustomed to deal with large counties in England, could hardly understand how poor the Highlands were. He hoped that in future, whenever assistance was asked for from the Board for such purposes as he had indicated, the Board would be willing to make a grant without requiring any contribution from the county.

*Mr. MACONOCHIE said the Congested Districts Board had done yeoman service in the Highlands and Islands of Scotland, but he thought more might be done in the direction of trying to help in a commercial way the inhabitants of these districts. Some new manufacture might be introduced to help the fishermen and crofters. One great difficulty these men laboured under was the heavy cost of the transit of their fish. He remembered some years ago visiting the Island of St. Kilda, and on that occasion there were probably some three or four tons of halibut lying on the beach for want of transit. When they considered that the transit rates for many of the different kinds of fish caught on the West Coast of Scotland came to nearly 50 per cent. of the total proceeds realised in the market, he thought the Congested Districts Board ought to direct its attention to a cheaper method of transit, which would benefit these districts materially. There was, he heard, a big development in the peat industry. In the Island of Lewis and along the West Coast of Scotland they had large bodies of peat, and if it could be dealt with he felt sure it would be a benefit to the people. In 1874 he went to Stornaway and opened quite a new business, which brought many hundreds of thousands of pounds into the district. With regard to the question of the crofters and the cutting up of deer forests, he thought those landlords who had acted in a most liberal manner ought to be encouraged. When Lady Gordon Cathcart came into the possession of the Island of Barra there were only 8,000 acres divided among the crofters. She spent money on harbours and piers, and made roads, also cut up another 4,000 acres amongst her crofter tenants making a total of 12,000 acres, and it was only justice to acknowledge what she had done. As to the deer forests, no tenants had been displaced in his memory, but he should be glad if anything could be done to keep the tenants on the soil. He did not look on the Congested Districts Board with any disfavour, but he felt sure that the time would come when the land question of Scotland would have to be dealt with, not by tinkering the present laws, but as a whole, and he felt sure that something in the nature of Lord Ashbourne's Act would eventually have to be applied to Scotland.

*Mr. WEIR said that much had been heard about the angelic manner in which Lady Gordon Cathcart managed her affairs, and he only wished there were more of the angelic order in the Highlands. Reference had been made to the peat industry, but what was the use of such suggestions if the people could not get the peat? If the Congested Districts Board could secure the control of the peat lands it would be a practical step, as it was essential that they should catch their hare before they could cook it. The want of seed had also been mentioned. Again and again he had called the attention of the Congested Districts Board to the need for seed in the Island of Lewis—he had done so at the request of a parish council in the island—and, as the people were not of a begging or cadging order, it must be taken that that request would not have been made without grave cause. But the Board merely stated that they would not give any more seed this year to districts which had been supplied before. The fact was, the Board would not take the trouble to ascertain whether or not real distress was prevailing. Who could be surprised at the manner in which these matters were managed, when it was remembered that the gentleman in charge merely received a small annual sum from the Board, and was, in fact, a servant of the Exchequer and Audit Department? If the work of the Congested Districts Board was to be properly attended to, it was necessary that a man should be appointed who could give his whole time to the business. In the early days of the Board it was said there was not sufficient work for such an appointment, but, although that plea would not now hold good, the old system still went on, and would probably continue to the end of the chapter. For six years this torture and misery, muddling and mismanagement had gone on, he hoped the seventh year would open up a brighter era. It was a great disadvantage that the members of the Board were unpaid; if they drew salaries they could be told either to do their work properly or to clear out, but no such effective treatment could be meted out under existing circumstances. The question of the cheap transit of fish seemed never to have occurred to the Board. On the West Coast one man had control of the steamers, and he imposed just what rates he chose. Why did not the Board make some efforts in that matter?

There were many areas in his constituency which were terribly congested, but were not classed as congested districts. He would take only one—that of Loch Carron. In that district there were many fine deer forests which fetched high rents, but there was also a tremendous amount of congestion. These high rents, however, prevented the district being classed as congested. The Board drew a hard and fast line, and declared that if the valuation exceeded £1 per head of the population the district could not be described as a congested area. They ought to relax their rules, and throw a little common sense into the business. A fisherman must get his living partly out of the sea and partly out of the land for he could not go to sea during stormy weather. A quarter of an acre of land was not sufficient for him, and he ought at least to have enough land to keep a cow. He was aware that in many districts the poor children got no milk at all, and these people ought to have sufficient land to enable the crofter or the crofter fisherman to keep a cow, in order that he might have butter and cheese and milk for his children. At the present time in some places they had to go miles for milk, and if the farmer had a grudge against any particular persons he would not let them have any milk at all. The hon. Member opposite had referred to goats, and he should like to find out whether goats were likely to thrive in those parts of the congested districts. He wished to point out that while the Congested Districts Board had no power to construct railways they could construct roads and arrange for the running of motor-cars, thus providing transport facilities which would be an undoubted advantage to many parts of the Western Highlands. He advised them to make experiments with motor-cars with a view of opening up the Highland districts.

The Report which had been presented to the House was a very full one but it was full of very stale matter. It contained a good deal of what had happened from the first day that the Congested Districts Board was formed. A history of that kind was not wanted every year, and all they required was an account of what had been done during the past twelve months. He was glad to notice that the Report showed that the Congested Districts Board had displayed a little more energy this year, and the slightest advance in that respect was most acceptable. He deeply regretted that more had not been done for the people living in the Island of Lewis. What had been done there? Why, only one small farm, providing for some thirty-two crofters, had been purchased, but more ought to be done in a district where there was such awful congestion. There was urgent necessity for the provision of more land for crofters' holdings in the Island of Lewis, where there was, at the present time, one farm six miles square right in the midst of all this congestion. That was a state of things which ought not to be allowed to exist. They had been told that the Highland landlords were ready to sell their land, but he denied it, and he should be only too pleased if the Congested Districts Board would personally interview the Highland landlords. Some time ago a circular was sent out to the landlords and when he was told that negotiations were pending he had always awaited the result. It was very unsatisfactory to find so many cases where they heard no more about the negotiations. In his own constituency he knew that the landlords had not responded to the circular letter sent out by the Congested Districts Board, and he wished to know if the Board had followed that circular up. The constituency of his hon. friend the Member for Argyllshire was practically in the same position as his own constituency. What right had those who drew up the Report to cast a slur on Members of this House by saying that they stood in the way of the Government passing the Bill to amend the Congested District Act? Members representing the Highlands never stood in the way of the Bill being advanced. His fear was that it would be allowed to slide for another year just as it had been allowed to slide for the last three years.

Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY said there was nothing in the Report casting a slur on the Members of this House.

***Mr. WEIR** said the statement to which he referred might be in the appendix, but there was certainly a statement somewhere in the document to the effect that hon. Members had not allowed the Bill to go through. He urged the right hon. Gentleman to go ahead with the Bill. His fear was that this would not be done.

***The CHAIRMAN**: It is not in order to go into the prospects of legislation.

***Mr. WEIR** said he should not have touched on this matter but for the reference to it in the Report. He had no doubt the Secretary for Scotland would take the hint and push matters forward. As to marine works not a penny had been expended in his constituency, and he thought the Congested Districts Board might take this matter into consideration and set aside a sum of money for the purpose. For the year 1903–4 the sum of £2,700 was put down for the Gravir and Cromore Road, but not a penny of that money had been parted with. The Report stated that the amount had been cancelled. What did that mean? He was sure the right hon. Gentleman had no desire to mislead the Committee, but this item had been very much muddled. The amount for "miscellaneous works" was £2,818, and of that sum the large county of Ross only received £167. He should like to know whether any steps had been taken to finish the road which had been in hand so long between Carloway and Stornoway. That road would provide a means of communication from the western to the eastern side of the Island of Lewis which would be of much service for the conveyance of fish caught on the Western Coast. The road was made for two-thirds of the distance, and he did not understand why it was not completed. He trusted the right hon. Gentleman would see that something was done without further delay. As to the purchase of land in Skye by the Congested Districts Board from the trustees of the late George Alexander Baird, he found that the approval of the Court of Chancery had not yet been obtained. Was this matter likely to hang in the Courts for months, or perhaps years? It had taken six years to get a small farm of 254 acres, in the Island of Lewis, where the people were living under the most awful conditions. In regard to the twenty-nine quarter-acre feus which had been secured, near Stornoway, he was told every year that the houses would soon be constructed but not one of them had yet been built. What was the cause of this delay? A good deal of land had been secured in Invernessshire. On what terms were the people to get these holdings? If they were to be on lease the same trouble would arise which had been felt in days gone by. The tenant at the end of the lease would run the risk of being thrust out of his home after spending his all on the holding. The lease system was a bad one. There were, no doubt, some good landlords, but there were also bad ones. One bad landlord could do no end of mischief in a countryside. The present landlord might be a very good man but his successor might be a tyrant.

Then they had the old story of the bees and poultry. The people wanted some instruction in bee-keeping; it was not enough to send them a bee-hive. And it was the same in regard to poultry-keeping. He would be delighted if large supplies of eggs and chickens and honey could be obtained from the Highland crofters; but the Congested Districts Board would never do any good until they realised the fact that the crofters needed instruction. That was what was done in Ireland. He would be glad if the Board would continue to make grants for roads, because the new Education Fund would swallow up the money from the Equivalent Grant which had hitherto been devoted to the construction and maintenance of foot-paths and foot-bridges. The people were too poor to provide roads and pathways for themselves. He was thinking of the poor children who had to go over rough moors to school; and unless the pathways were maintained, the children, especially in winter, would not be able to attend school. The Board in their Report said that they had not added any parish to the congested area within the year. They ought to be ashamed of themselves, and of the hard-and-fast rules that they had made. He could not understand the rules as to the repayment of the price for seed potatoes. The people had paid for the seeds they had got before, and why could not the Board continue to supply this seed in these bad times? The people showed they were quite willing and anxious to make repayment. There was a paragraph about fishermen's dwellings, but he insisted that unless the cottages were provided with more than a quarter-acre lot the scheme would not be a success. In regard to loans for the purchase of boats, the Report stated that it was a question whether the advances should be made by the Government or by private persons. He knew a gentleman in the Island of Lewis, Mr. E. Mackenzie, shipbuilder, who had nobly come to the front and built boats for the fishermen, and fitted them out. That gentleman was getting his money back, but he could not extend these facilities, as he is not a millionaire. The advances should be made by the Congested Districts Board, and he was glad to hear that the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland was prepared to approach the Treasury and ask for an advance of money to the fishermen for better and larger boats. The fishermen were decent, honest, genuine, hardworking fellows, and were anxious to pay their debts. They were not schemers or swindlers. He hoped the Secretary for Scotland would not regard for a moment the remarks of men who knew absolutely nothing about the conditions of these people. They might want those fishermen some day; and the Congested Districts Board ought to realise the importance of the fishing industry. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would do something to reform the Congested Districts Board. He would support the suggestion of his hon. friends that the work of the Board should be handed over to the Crofter Commission, which had done such excellent work and which had proved a godsend to the people.

COLONEL DENNY (Kilmarnock Burghs) said that in districts where poverty existed there was a keen desire on the part of the younger members of the community to improve their position and in many cases to learn trades. A society of which he was cognisant encouraged boys to leave their homes in the Highlands and become apprentices to firms in the South. The firms could not give them higher wages than were given to other apprentices, and the society subsidised the boys to a small extent by making up the difference between their wages and the cost of living. It was quite evident that a very fine class of workmen could be drawn from those districts; and, in that way, not only would the industry of the country be improved but a great deal would be done to remove congestion and poverty in the Highlands. If the Secretary for Scotland could make known that the Congested Districts Board would advance the small amount necessary to supplement the wages paid to those apprentices until they received wages large enough to support themselves, he would be doing a great deal to help the smarter lads in the Highlands; and, at the same time, would materially assist the labour market. He knew from his own experience that such a scheme would be largely utilised and he would suggest to the Secretary for Scotland that it should be adopted.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY said that the discussion was now a considerable time in progress. It was commenced by the hon. Member for Orkney and Shetland, who asked in particular some question about a road. He would make inquiries into the matter; but the hon. Gentleman could not expect him to sort of honour cheques, according to his own account of the story, of some local gentlemen who first voted for and then against the hon. Gentleman. That change was probably due to the hon. Gentleman himself rather than to the unfortunate landed proprietor; and was one of the disadvantages of sitting alternately on both sides of the House. The matter of the sea-fishing regulations had not been lost sight of, and he was prepared to carry out the pledge of his predecessor, Lord Balfour of Burleigh. The matter was actually in the hands of the Department of Woods and Forests, and was complicated by the legal question which was now raised as to whether the Crown had in Orkney and Shetland the same rights with reference to salmonidae in Orkney and Shetland as they had in other parts of Scotland. That depended on whether the law had a different application, and whether the old Scottish statutes were or were not held to include the question. He believed that a test question was to be raised, and it was quite obvious that until the question was settled it would be quite impossible for the Crown to make arrangements, when, as a matter of fact, they might not have the necessary authority. He acknowledged with great pleasure the speech of the hon. Member for Aberdeenshire, because he gave very generous, though he was was sorry to say somewhat tardy, recognition on the part of others of the noble efforts of Lady Gordon Cathcart. He was glad the spirit with which that lady had been actuated had at last been freely acknowledged.

He had the pleasure of listening for a considerable period to his hon. friend the Member for Ross and Cromarty. The hon. Member was in a scriptural vein and complained that he had to wait as long for his improvements as Jacob waited for a wife, and he said that the landlords were like Pharaoh and hardened their hearts. He had seen the hon. Gentleman before in this *rôle* of a grumbling Moses, and he was not very much disturbed thereby. He was, however, somewhat astonished at the speech of the hon. Member for Inverness-shire. On other occasions in past years he acknowledged that the hon. Member took a sober and sane view of the operations of the Congested Districts Board; but on this occasion his speech was marked by querulousness and unreasonableness that was quite foreign to his ordinary speeches in the House. The hon. Gentleman summed up the situation after reading the Report of the Board that he found little new and very little done. That was an assertion which he would leave anyone who had read the Report to deal with. It was perfectly certain that during the last two months, apart from anything else, they had bought land to the value of £100,000. That was a thing which hon. Members opposite had been asking for for years, and he quite understood, without claiming any credit for himself, that the action of the Board in that respect had the support and approval of hon. Members opposite. He was not going to take any credit to himself which he did not deserve. He had not inaugurated a new policy or changed what his noble predecessor did before. It was only owing to the prudent disposition of Lord Balfour of Burleigh and the way in which he managed the finances of the Board during its early years in order to effect those purchases. Year after year hon. Members opposite used to point to the large balances at the credit of the Board and he himself had often to express an opinion how exceedingly unreasonable those criticisms were. If he might say so without offence, hon. Members opposite were like children who wanted to see a plant growing before their very eyes. The full measure of the prudence displayed by Lord Balfour of Burleigh had only been really shown in its true proportions this year. What were the facts? He would pass over the purchase of Glendale Estate, but hon. Members would know very well that probably there was no part of Scotland in which they could have acted better in putting the lands in the control of the occupants and allaying passions which in the past had given trouble to many. It was well known to Members that this was the head of the unfortunate agitation which occurred many years ago, and he was very glad to be able to make that purchase. The other purchase was much more important, viz., the Kilmuir Estate. According to competent authorities that was one of the very best estates for the purpose of crofter settlement that could have been acquired, and it was not because it was in Inverness and not in Ross that it was acquired, but because it was such a good estate. He thought it was rather ungrateful that the hon. Member for Inverness had told the Committee the tale of woe he did.

*MR. JOHN DEWAR said that he gave the Board credit for land purchase.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY said that the hon. Gentleman wanted the Board to spend all their money on land purchase and give him everything else he wanted as well. As a matter of fact negotiations for the purchase of the estate were undertaken some years ago during the tenure of office of his noble friend. They had not then sufficient money to purchase the whole estate and the proprietor quite rightly declined to sell a portion of it

Now owing to their larger resources they had been able to buy the whole estate *en bloc* when it came into the market and to make what he believed to be a very good bargain. But that sort of thing could not have been done if Lord Balfour had listened to and dealt with the complaints made year after year that the Congested Districts Board had done nothing but sit with its hands in its pockets, because there would never have been a balance to make a really good bargain when opportunity arose.

*Mr. JOHN DEWAR: How did the Irish Congested Districts Board do so?

*Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: I will come to that in a moment. Continuing, the right hon. Gentleman said on the general policy he might say he had at last redeemed the Congested Districts Board from the opprobrium which had always fallen upon it before for having every desire to burke land purchase. He had not changed the policy of Lord Balfour, who would, had he remained in office three months longer, have carried through the purchase which had taken place. But so far as the Congested Districts Board was concerned in doing good for the people, he held that land purchase, though a great object, was not the main object of the Board, and for carrying into the country the means and capacity of improvement and self-help more would be done in the long run by other things than by land purchase. Land purchase would never do more than touch the fringe of the question, and there could be no better illustration of this than the state of the Island of Lewis, which was the most congested spot in the Western Highlands. If all the land was taken away and given to the inhabitants to-morrow Lewis would be just as congested on the day after as it was to-day. Until sub-squatting was absolutely prohibited congestion would never be got rid of. With regard to the interpolation of the hon. Member for Inverness-shire it was no part of his (Mr. Graham Murray's) business to detract from any praise the hon. Member had given to the Irish Congested Districts Board, but when the hon. Member came to establish his illustration he signally failed. One must judge people by their resources, and the Congested Districts Board of Ireland had twice the income of the Scottish Board, besides which it had two enormous funds, which Scotland had not, on which to borrow. It had an unlimited fund so far as land purchase was concerned, and for other purposes it had a fund on which to borrow of £1,500,000. What was the use of comparing the actual output so to speak of the work of those two bodies whose resources showed so great a disparity? In the catalogue of the various things which the Irish Congested Districts Board did, with which the hon. Gentleman favoured the Committee, there were many things actually outside the power of the Scottish Board. The hon. Member had made a great point of what the Irish Congested Districts Board had done for the Irish fisheries, which was about as bad an illustration as the hon. Gentleman could take. Until a few years ago the knowledge of the proper methods of fishing was in a very unsatisfactory state, and the operations of the Irish Congested Districts Board was of an educational character, and the hon. Member reached the height of absurdity when he suggested that the methods of the Irish Congested Districts Board should be copied in that matter. The hon. Member for Inverness-shire surely could not have read page 24 of the Report with regard to this.

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee Report Progress; to sit again this evening

EVENING SITTING.

ALLEGED ILL-TREATMENT OF NATIVES IN SOUTH AFRICA.

Adjournment (under Standing Order No.10).

Major SEELY (Isle of Wight) said in rising to move the adjournment of the House it was not necessary for him to apologise for having interrupted the business of the House on account of the matter to which he wished to call attention not being sufficiently urgent or important. When any one of His Majesty's subjects or indeed anyone in His Majesty's dominions was subjected to ill-treatment this House had always in the past, and would continue in the future, to demand that the case should receive the fullest investigation. A body of fresh evidence having now arrived in this country with regard to the treatment of the natives in the mines the House would pardon him for bringing the matter forward. He was quite sure that, apart from any question of politics or of opinion about the particular kind of labour that should be employed in South Africa, in the minds of almost every Member of the House and of almost every one in this country there was a growing sense of profound anxiety as to whether there was any truth in the persistent rumours and allegations that the natives were being treated unfairly, improperly, and in some cases cruelly. As the result of a question put in the Cape Parliament by Mr. Fuller, now a member of the progressive Government of that colony, the then Cape Government appointed a Commission to investigate why the natives did not go to the Rand in greater numbers to seek employment. At the head of the Commission was Mr. Brownlee, and sixteen native chiefs were chosen from the various districts. It was a friendly Commission sent by the Cape Government with the view of obtaining more employment for the natives. They proceeded to Johannesburg, and for some time were engaged in visiting the various compounds and railway centres. In due course they returned and each member of the Commission made out a separate report, the whole of which had been summed up by Mr. Stamford, whose statement was a most remarkable one. There was a unanimous opinion that there had been unfair and improper treatment in respect of the wages being paid at a less rate than was promised. Although there was a divergence of opinion between Mr. Brownlee and the chiefs as to cruelty, flogging, and other matters, there was no divergence as to payment of wages being less than what was promised. The hon. Member then quoted extracts from the Blue-book issued to the Cape Parliament to show that in every case almost this same complaint was made. Mr. Brownlee, who accompanied the Commission, said that, taking it all round, the treatment of the natives was generally good, but he qualified that by showing that in many cases there was unkind treatment. That statement brought him to a point which had been mentioned on previous occasions, namely, that a little leaven of cruelty leavened the whole lump, and since the Witwatersrand Labour Supply Association came into existence there was no competition among mine-owners for labour, and therefore there was no incentive to treat the labourers better seeing that no more labour could be obtained by so doing. The shortness of labour was largely due to the cases of cruelty in the treatment of the natives—cases which he could not admit to be few in number. Having regard to the evidence of Mr. Stamford, assistant chief magistrate, who forwarded the whole Report and summed up its conclusions, he said that misrepresentations with regard to wages were made by the labour agents; that occasionally wrongful deductions were made, and that assaults by European overseers and by the police were of frequent occurrence. Under these circumstances it was not likely that more labour would be obtained for the mines, but the question was whether this House, which was responsible for what had been done by these men, was to blame for allowing a state of affairs, which was not worthy of a great nation like ourselves. to continue. If these were the facts, they required more than ordinary attention from the Government and from the House.

If hon. Members] had known of what was in this book, much that had been done in the last few months would never have been done. There was a general feeling of distrust in the House as to whether the conditions of labour on the Rand were such as ought to be permitted under the British Crown, and the reason for that distrust was the terrible mortality in the South African mines. For the last year that rate averaged 80 per 1,000, and it was said that the cause was a sudden epidemic of influenza, but during the last six months it had increased to nearly 90 per 1,000. People were in the habit of reading the death rate of great towns in this country, and in some it was as high as 18 or 20 per 1,000, but what would be said if it rose to half those figures. That was nearly 20 times the rate of mortality in English mines. What was the cause? There was no other employment in any part of the world which showed such a terrible mortality. One of the reasons was that the mines were not properly ventilated and another was that the sleeping quarters for the miners were unfit for habitation, and if it were true, as stated in the reports, that sick men were forced to work, that also might account for a good number of the deaths. It was evident that a state of affairs prevailed on the Rand which was a discredit to South Africa, and to this country, which allowed it to continue. Now they saw the whole sordid story. The only safeguard for these natives was that when the conditions became intolerable they need not go to the mines. But now this country was asked to enable the mine-owners to escape the necessary consequences of not maintaining proper conditions for their labourers. It was enough to make Members of the House of Commons ashamed of themselves. Hitherto complaints on this subject had lacked the support of the necessary statistics; but this Report supplied that confirmation. Members who voted for Chinese labour must now see that they were wrong, and he respectfully asked the House of Commons, even at the eleventh hour, to pause before taking any step to perpetuate this shame.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Major Seely.*)

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL (Oldham) said that the importance of his hon. and gallant friend's Motion was aggravated by the proposal of the Government to introduce Chinese labour into the South African mines to replace the natives who had been driven away by the treatment which his hon. friend had described. The facts of this Blue-book were an absolute justification for any hon. Gentleman who had voted against Chinese labour. We had been confronted with a shortage of labour in South Africa, though there were enough natives to work all the mines many times over, and this Blue-book supplied the reason for it. There were enough natives to work all the mines many times over, but they had a great reluctance to go, and this Blue-book, which had so fortunately and fortuitously come to hand, supplied the reason. As his hon. and gallant friend had told the House, a Commission was appointed in August of last year on the Motion of a gentleman who was now a Minister in Dr. Jameson's Government. The official representing the Native Department, who was placed at the head of the Commission, was a man of very high qualifications, Mr. Brownlee; and the headmen of the different tribes in the great native district under Cape Colony were selected by the Secretary to the Department of Native Affairs, who was assisted in his selection by Sir Godfrey Lagden and others. The Commission which proceeded to Johannesburg in September were afforded all possible facilities by the Government of the Transvaal for making themselves thoroughly acquainted with the whole state of affairs, and they recognised the fact in their Report. They were undoubtedly an observant body. One of the first things they noticed was that—

> "At various of the compounds the boys complained of being hurried by means of the application by the native police of the gentle stimulus of cow-hide. That there is ground for the complaint I think there can be no doubt; and at the Geldenhuis Deep, where there are a number of Pondos employed, a native policeman in our presence began an impartial administration of this form of stimulation to the crowd which surrounded us, and when asked why he did it, replied that he wished thereby to show his respect for us and to remove the crowd which he said he thought was causing us annoyance. Whether this practice is universal or not, what at any rate was noticeable was that almost without exception the compound police carried sjamboks, and at the Village Deep, where a number of boys from the Transkeian territories are employed, there were complaints of this hustling by the compound police."

There was almost a touch of humour in the next comment—

> "It will, I think, be readily conceded that under any circumstances an inquiry having for its object the elicitation of complaints against employers by employees, is one demanding a certain amount of delicacy of handling. This difficulty we felt in a more marked degree by reason of the fact that we were in a manner dependent on the courtesy of the people and authority of the Transvaal, and that the employers were always present, and the employees for that very reason were under a certain sense of moral restraint."

Mr. Brownlee was no fanatic, and there was much in his Report which showed that he was not anxious to press the case unduly against the mine-owners. That he desired to state the truth, but no more than the truth, might be shown by one illustration. It used to be the practice to punish the Cape boys by putting them in stocks and dark cells. The new Government, to Lord Milner's credit, collected those stocks and burned them. Mr. Brownlee did not omit to mention this fact, and he stated that in his opinion the treatment of the natives at the mines was generally good. How far that expression of opinion was justified the House would be able to judge from the extracts his hon. and gallant friend had read. The Commissioners remained at Johannesburg for about a week, during which time they visited a great number of compounds and interviewed many persons. In particular, Mr. Brownlee had an interview with Mr. Macfarlane, the general manager of the Witwatersrand Native Labour Supply Association. The evidence was very interesting, and he hoped that his right hon. friend would see that this Blue-book was in the hands of every Member some time in the course of the next week. Mr. Brownlee said, among other things, to Mr. Macfarlane—

> "I cannot get over an impression that the native police at the compounds are in the habit of hustling boys and quickening their movements by a gentle application of cow-hide. I do not think the men like this."

Headman Bungiso Sangqu stated—

> "One word I would like to say upon a point which has just been touched upon, and that is, that under the heading of ill-treatment was the beating of natives, which was considered by the natives as a great insult."

The instructive part of the interview was Mr. Macfarlane's answer. He said—

> "With regard to the question of ill-treatment, I have looked into that personally, and I have visited several mines where the complaints were most bitter, and I really feel satisfied that the mine authorities in one instance where they used a certain amount of corporal correction were entitled to do so. This particular instance was one of insubordination. The head man of the gang, after repeated warnings, continued to incite the remainder of the gang to stop work, and disregard reasonable and proper instructions on the part of the mine officials. This was the most serious complaint that was brought forward to my knowledge, and, as I say, it appeared to me as one which called for correction on the part of the mine officials."

Mr. Brownlee's comment upon this was—

> "That the administration of a certain amount of corporal correction by the compound managers exists will, I think, be admitted after reference to the notes of an interview which I had with the chairman of the Witwatersrand Native Labour Association. I do not think that any power of this nature should be left in the hands of compound managers."

The right hon. Gentleman who a year ago was Secretary for the Colonies did a number of things during his tenure of office to which many people were able to give only a modified measure of support, but he carried the House as a whole with him when he was able greatly to reduce the amount of flogging which took place all over the British Empire. It was a question on which the right hon. Gentleman held very strong personal views. They were a survival of views which he held when he entertained other views upon many other questions. He did not know that he would go quite so far as the right hon. Gentleman did in this matter, because, having been out in that country, he could conceive of certain circumstances in which corporal punishment moderately administered was less cruel to these men, who were almost children, than cooping them up in prisons and dark cells. But there was one kind of corporal punishment which the House ought to condemn without the slightest reservation, and that was the punishment which was administered, not by the authority of the law, but at the caprice and will of any petty tyrant of an overseer. All this indiscriminate bullying and stimulating movement "by the gentle application of cow-hide" was a gross breach of the criminal law, and ought to be proceeded against so that the guilty persons were punished in the most severe and exemplary manner.

Mr. Brownlee then came to what he considered the most serious complaint, one which the Commission found most widespread, and of the existence of the cause of which there seemed no reason to doubt, the complaint with regard to pay. The complaint was that the men had been paid at a very much lower rate than that which was promised to them by the recruiting agents. Mr. Brownlee said that in the great majority of the compounds visited this complaint was made, and that, although the Labour Association authorities strenuously insisted that this state of things did not exist, he was satisfied that it did exist. The Labour Association existed for the purpose of regulating and distributing native labour; it regulated the rate of wages, and paid the labourers. The majority of the mines were affiliated with it, and had entered into an agreement to obtain labour only through its medium. It was the "tied-house" principle, but the association dealt with labour instead of with liquor. The Labour Association employed a larger number of recruiting agents, some of whom were paid by salary, but the great majority by a commission proportionate to the number recruited. It was true that the rules of the association had been relaxed so far as to admit of individual mines sending out their own recruiting agents, but that was subject to the stipulation that all labourers so recruited should be passed through the books of the association. Mr. Brownlee charged the Labour Association with habitually indulging in fraudulent and misleading promises to the men. A single instance might be given. One of the natives whom he interviewed said his complaint was that he was promised £4 a month for working above ground, and that he only got £2 10s. for working underneath. "Who promised you £4?" asked the mine manager. "The recruiting agent," said the native. "Oh!" said the manager, "he was only making love to you." The Native Labour Association apparently did a great deal of this love-making, and he (the hon. Member) asked whether they were not liable to an action for "breach of promise."

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. LYTTELTON, Warwick and Leamington) thought the hon. Member was hardly correct in saying that Mr. Brownlee brought such charges against the Association as a whole.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL said he did not pretend to be quoting textually; but he thought in view of Mr. Brownlee's further statement that the Commission received no complaint from any labourer engaged independently of the Labour Association, and the frequent complaint throughout the whole Blue-book that the men had been promised more than they had received, he was justified in the general statement that the Association made fraudulent and misleading promises.

MR. LYTTELTON: The hon. Member is acute enough to see the difference between an isolated statement made by the agent of an association and authority given for such a statement by the association. I think the House is just enough to see that all of us are liable to have a bad servant. I do not think the House would say that a man whose servant has against his orders misrepresented him is himself guilty of that misrepresentation.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL said he had no desire to pursue the point. The House knew the enthusiasm which personal charges engendered in certain quarters, however little they were intended to wound or injure personally.

Mr. Brownlee continued—

"The second point in connection with pay which gives rise to complaint is this—that while the rate of pay offered to boys is £2 10s. per month for surface work, and £3 for mine work, these are not the sums for which they are contracted with the mines —the contract rate being 1s. 8d. and 2s. per diem respectively according to the locality of the work. Should a boy work every day in the month he may earn £2 10s. or £3. Now, were this explained to the boys and they clearly understood that they were paid by the day, pay would be docked for any day not worked, and the payments made punctually at the end of the month for the days actually worked, there would be no ground for complaint. But the boy is first told he is to get £2 10s. or £3 a month, and thinks he is a monthly servant. Then in the association compound he is told that he will be paid so much a day, and finally, in the mine compound he is told that he will be paid for thirty days work, the effect of this being that if through any fortuitous circumstances in any given month a boy has been able to work, say, only twenty-five days, he will have to go on and work five days into the next month before he receives his pay, and an element of confusion and dissatisfaction is at once introduced, while to make confusion worse confounded, the further element of notice becomes involved."

There was another aspect of the Labour Association that deserved consideration. If the men were engaged independently by the different mine-owners competing for their services the popular mine would gain. But this association enlisted a great number of men, and disposed of them as it wished. Consequently, all human incentive on the part of those who administered the mines was destroyed. No penalty attached to those who treated the men badly; no special reward was given to those who treated them well. Three mines were mentioned over and over again in the Blue-book as being particularly bad, viz. Geldenhuis, Village Deep, and Railway Compound.

MR. JOHN STROYAN (Perthshire, W.): A railway compound is not a mine.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL: It is an establishment, at any rate. I do not pretend to have the expert knowledge of the hon. Member; but it requires no expert knowledge to understand this Blue-book.

MR. JOHN STROYAN: It does not want expert knowledge, I think, to know that a railway compound is a place where natives working on the railway are kept.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL said that many of the mines had very peculiar names, and he was not at all satisfied that the hon. Member's interpretation was the correct one. The prejudice against employment in the mines was general because the natives did not know to which mine they might be sent. He made no general charge of inhumanity against the mine-owners. He had seen some of them fighting in the field, and no doubt many of them were perfectly humane. But the fact remained that, what with the influence of the Labour Association and what with the undoubted malpractices that went on in certain special localities, the whole of the Johannesburg mines had got an extremely bad name, and that was why the natives would not go there. Was it not rather a sad thing that Johannesburg, the great spring of wealth, where all the gold rose to the surface of the ground and where they ought to be able to pay the best wages and offer the most attractive conditions, should be in the mind of the South African native a place of melancholy tribulation and hard work? If the House would permit him he would read extracts from the reports of one or two of those native chiefs who were the head men of the different tribes, and doubtless what they told the Commissioners they would tell their own people. On page 22 of the Report a man named Langa said—

> "First, the labourers at Johannesburg complained of the wages. They stated that the labour agents in the territories promised them certain wages, but they were paid a great deal less. On ascertaining the amount of wages paid we were informed by the labourers that they were only paid from £1 10s. to £3 10s. per month, whereas the labour agents had promised them £3 10s. and upwards. The employers admitted that they were paying from £1 10s. to £3 10s. per month and that if the agents had promised more, they did so without authority.
>
> "Second, the labourers also complained of being thrashed by the Basuto and Tshangana (Shanguan) police who are over them, but we could not get to hear the reason.
>
> "Third, they also complained of being forced to work when ill, and did not get proper care and treatment; and when their friends wished to take them home, they were not allowed to do so; consequently a number died at the Rand for want of proper care and treatment.
>
> "Fourth, they also complained that they were forced to work on Sundays and stated that beyond its being wrong to work on Sundays, they required one day's rest out of the week."

Upon another occasion in the House of Commons much indignation was expressed at the suggestion that the importation of Chinese labour partook somewhat of the nature of slavery. He never agreed with that, but what condition of things did these facts indicate. These people were tricked into their period of service, they were paid less than they were promised, they were thrashed, they were forced to work when ill, they did not get proper care and treatment in illness, and when their friends wished to take them home they were not allowed to go, and they were forced to work on Sundays against their will without being given credit for overtime. He did not wish to be led into using any words which might excite the indignation of his right hon. friend, but if this state of things did not approach to the nature of slavery then they wanted a new word added to the English language. Here was the evidence of another chief on page 23—

> "We visited some twenty centres in Johannesburg and different towns in the neighbourhood. We found that the labourers complained of being thrashed in some of the centres; some saying the treatment is good.
>
> "They are also forced to work on Sundays against their will, and get no remuneration for that day.
>
> "The real ill-treatment is the thrashing, and low wages and the days calculated as a month.
>
> "They must not be thrashed. When they have done wrong they must be fined according

to the penalty provided by the law for the offence."

On page 25 it was stated—

> "There are all sorts of complaints made by the boys—that they are sjamboked and bullied by these stupid indunas—and that when they are sick they are not allowed to go home."

His hon. and gallant friend had read the very striking passage at the head of page 26, but on the next page was a statement that labourers proceeding to Johannesburg were also badly treated. that they were packed in trucks, and were not regarded as human beings. All these facts were corroborated by the assistant chief magistrate of that territory in a covering letter in this Blue-book. On the top of all came the death statistics, as a very grim and disquieting comment. Was there any wonder that the Cape Parliament passed a resolution with great unanimity and applause? What did all these facts come to? They seemed to him to provide a complete and discreditable explanation of the shortage of labour on the Rand. Could they wonder that the people would not go to work in the mines under those circumstances. He had ventured to read those extracts in support of the facts put forward by his hon. and gallant friend, and he did not think they required any further comment. They could all be read when the Blue-book was circulated to hon. Gentlemen in the House, and in the country, and he was sure they would be read with anger and with sorrow.

He would only venture to make two further observations to his right hon. friend and to the House upon the facts as they had been disclosed. His right hon. friend had been called unexpectedly to occupy a great position, and that he had filled that position in a manner unexpected even by his friends would not be contradicted by anyone on either side of the House. His right hon. friend had the reputation of being a liberal-minded man. He was once a Liberal, but he was now a Liberal Unioinist, which was not quite the same thing. He was quite sure he did not wish to signalise his tenure of the Colonial Office by any degradation of the standard of treatment meted out by officials and white men under his authority towards the native races. With that in his mind he would like to ask his right hon. friend whether he did not think that the facts disclosed in this Blue-book constituted a case for action in South Africa, and for delay in some of the operations he was carrying out in that country. He wished to ask the right hon. Gentleman this question. He was ransacking the whole world for labour for the mines, he had been prepared to face extraordinary Parliamentary difficulties for the purpose, to take infinite trouble and cause infinite vexation and irritation, and he had not been afraid to hurt the feelings of many people who had voted solidly for him and his policy for a long time and who, irrespective of Party feelings, regarded the importation of Chinese labour as a bitter affront to them. Before making a new experiment, sinister in its character and far-reaching in its consequences, might it not have been worth while for the right hon. Gentleman to ask his officers in South Africa to look beneath their own feet and see what was going on in the workings of the Rand mines? Might not the remedying of existing grievances and the meting out of a higher standard of treatment to these natives have afforded some solution of the vexed and tangled problems of the South African labour supply?

He would make one other remark in vindication of the course his hon. and gallant friend had adopted. A good many people said that the House of Commons took too much interest in subjects of this kind, and that they were inclined to be carried away by humanitarian considerations. They were told that the people who were interesting themselves in this matter were hysterical and maudlin. Those who reprobated humanitarian sentiment in others were very often people who had never seen a man flogged or killed. But the responsibility of the House in these matters was very great. They exerted influence and authority over the affairs of more than 400,000,000 people. Every official, from the highest to the lowest, from the Viceroy to the smallest Jack-in-office, in the whole hierarchy of the British Empire was influenced by the standard which was upheld or lowered in that House. Therefore they were bound in all cases of cruelty and the invasion of the rights of subject races to be vigilant and emphasise these facts even if it meant interrupting the course of Parliamentary business and causing inconvenience, especially when such facts were brought before them upon official information collected by men on the spot acquainted with the affairs of the locality, and embodied in formal State Papers presented to a Colonial House of Parliament under the authority of the Crown. But if they were bound to be careful everywhere they must be more careful still in regard to the South African goldfields, where more than 80,000 persons were concentrated within a very restricted area under conditions which were unusually artifical and almost unnatural. We were just as much responsible for what went on in the goldfields of South Africa as we should be if the compounds, instead of being thousands of miles across the sea, were in Regent's Park or St. James's Park. The labour of these men, and the conditions under which they lived, made an immediate and sensible effect upon the quotations of the share markets and upon the incomes of certain very rich people, and for that reason they should be doubly careful. We must not only regard the financial interests of these prosperous companies, but we must remember the human interest of the miner at the bottom of the mine. There was on page 29 in the evidence of one of the native chiefs, a statement which had a rather sad touch about it, for he said—

> "The men do not know where to go when they are ill-treated or cheated. The officers there in charge do not seem to understand the natives or have any sympathy for them."

That statement was wrong, because there was always one place where they could bring their grievances, and that was to the British Parliament. Whatever answer his right hon. friend the Colonial Secretary might be able to make, whatever check this discussion might impose on his plans for the importation of Asiatic labour to replace the labour that was now being driven away, there was one thing he hoped the Motion of his hon. and gallant friend would establish. He hoped it would establish clearly that in all the wide dominions of the King there was no man so unfortunate and so humble as to have his ill-treatment beneath the notice of that House, and that there was no province in the British Empire so distant as to be beyond their reach.

Mr. LYTTELTON: Mr. Speaker, we have debated upon three rather conspicuous occasions the policy of Chinese labour in South Africa, and the House has affirmed by considerable majorities, and increasing majorities, on each occasion, the necessity under which His Majesty's Government labour in countenancing and sanctioning the Ordinance which has been passed in the Transvaal. We are now asked, incidentally, by my two hon. friends, to embark once more in that debate. I do not intend to go back upon what has been already done, or to rediscuss questions which in this House have already been settled. If I were tempted to re-embark upon the matter, I could find a very sufficient justification for the policy which has been pursued in the two speeches, one made in my own hearing, in support of Chinese labour in the Transvaal made last year by my hon. friend who seconded this Motion. I do not deny the right to him of receding from the opinions which he entertained last year on this subject, and I should be ill-requiting the generosity with which he has spoken of me if I spoke with any bitterness of his change of opinion. All I will say is that if I were to ask for support of the policy of the Transvaal Government I could not do much better than invite the House to study the speeches made only twelve months ago by my hon. friend in support of that policy.

Mr. WINSTON CHURCHILL: It is perfectly true that I do not view the project in favour of the introduction of Chinese labour from the same point of view as many hon. Gentlemen opposite. I have distinctly stated, and I adhere entirely to that statement, that if you can prove that South Africa does not object, and if you can prove that the conditions are not inhuman, I should have no objection. But that is just what we have always asked in vain for my right hon. friend to do.

***Mr. SPEAKER**: I ought to remind both the hon. Member and the right hon. Gentleman that a debate on the Chinese labour question would not be in order upon this Motion.

MR. LYTTELTON: I did not intend to pursue it for a moment longer, but my hon. friend having characterised that policy as one of a sinister character, I thought it well to remind the House that he at one time was a supporter of it. My hon. and gallant friend who moved this Motion, doubtless impelled by an irresistible desire to vindicate the wrongs of the natives in the Transvaal, for which I give him full credit, has thought fit to read from the evidence in the Report of Mr. Brownlee all that the Report contains hostile to his own countrymen and not a single passage in favour of them. I am sure there is not a man in this House, even if he has feelings of hostility to the Government and even to the country in their policy, who would desire that it should go forth from the floor of this House that scandalous conduct had been committed by any one of their fellow-countryman when there lies ready at hand, and in the same volume, contradiction of those statements made by the natives themselves—no more, it is true, worthy of credence than those which my hon. and gallant friend has read, but still at least in an assembly of Englishman, it is desirable and fair that they should be read as well as those which besmirch the character and impugn the motives of our fellow-countrymen in the Transvaal.

MAJOR SEELY: I am sure the House will excuse me. The right hon. Gentleman is really making an accusation against me, imputing bad faith, which he would certainly not have made if he had been attending to my speech. The strongest part of this Report in favour of my countrymen, as he says, is the statement of Mr. Brownlee "that the treatment is generally good." Those hon. Gentlemen opposite who attended, which the right hon. Gentleman, no doubt being busy at the time, did not, will have noticed that I read out that particular passage, and I beg to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he does not think he owes me some apology.

MR. LYTTELTON: I was referring to the passages from the statements of the chiefs that were read out by my hon. and gallant friend. I think he read two passages, and he entirely omitted to read passages from three or even four chiefs who substantially said that there was absolutely nothing to complain of in the mines.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL: Read them yourself.

MR. LYTTELTON: My hon. friend the junior Member for Oldham says, "Read them yourself." I will read them; but I put it to the Members of the House, and I put it to my hon. friends, for I am perfectly certain that on reconsideration they will feel it themselves, whether it is their view of patriotic duty that in a case where evidence has been given on both sides, and when they appear here in their responsibility as, so to say, prosecutors and indicters of their fellow-countrymen in the Transvaal, they should read passages from the evidence in chief that is in favour of the prosecution, and should altogether omit to read the passages which are in favour of the defence. Is it right, and I appeal to the judgment of fair-minded men on either side of the House, that Members of this Party, sitting on this side of the House, should bring this case against their fellow-countrymen in the Transvaal as a matter of great public urgency which will not wait for a day, and obtain your decision, Mr. Speaker, on that footing, when I told my hon. and gallant friend, in answer to a Question this evening, that I was prepared directly to lay the Papers dealing with this subject before the House? It was only last Saturday that I received from Sir Godfrey Lagden, who has done more for the natives than any man in this country, the final Report dealing with the whole of this subject. It was sent at my own urgent and immediate request after I saw in Mr. Brownlee's Report the charges that were made against the proprietors of the mines. It is surely wrong and not right to bring before this House only half a case, when by waiting a couple of days you can have the whole case. I told my hon. and gallant friend that the Blue-book would be published directly, and I assured the hon. Gentleman the Member for the Rushcliffe Division, a few days ago, that the Papers would be published at an early date.

MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): The right hon. Gentleman has been telling me that story for three or four weeks.

MR. LYTTELTON: Does the right hon. Gentleman wish to impute either negligence or ill-faith in this matter?

MR. JOHN ELLIS: The right hon. Gentleman has told me for weeks that the Papers would be published at an early date.

MR. LYTTELTON: It is a trifling matter. But perhaps the hon. Gentleman will suggest how, when I received this Blue-book only on Saturday last——

MR. JOHN ELLIS: I will suggest it now if you like.

MR. LYTTELTON: I really do not very much care what he does suggest. Unless he is a greater expert at the printer's craft than the King's printers, I do not think he could reasonably suggest that material such as I hold in my hand, which was received only on Saturday last, could have been published before this week. But let the House consider, is it right, or is it fair, dealing with people 6,000 or 7,000 miles away, dealing with charges which are made and with regard to which, I agree, there is evidence on both sides—is it fair for hon. Gentlemen in this House, members of this Government, presumably supporters of the Government [OPPOSITION laughter]—well, I leave my hon. friends and appeal to the other side. Would fair-minded Members on the other side think it right on Wednesday to bring forward a case which would have been complete on Friday, but which would have had the demerit of containing the case of their own fellow-countrymen instead of only the case for the other side? Now, I will obey my hon. friend's injunction and read the evidence of the chiefs which they have declined or omitted to read. It appears on page 24. A gentleman of the name of Bondwayo says—

> "On my arrival there (Johannesburg) I proceeded to the different compounds and there I saw that the natives were well treated at work, and that they were well fed. They only submitted to me two complaints—first that when they are sick they are not allowed to return home; and second, that when they are engaged here they are generally told that the wages were £3 or £4, and that when they get to Johannesburg their wages are reduced to £2 10s. per month."

Hon. Gentlemen appear to be so little acquainted with the process of investigation that they applaud to the echo the statements of a witness which are apparently discredited by a man of his own country and his own bias. The next sentence is, and this is the judgment in the matter—

> "I am prepared to tell all the natives in this district that the treatment of native labourers in Johannesburg is a very good one. As far as my own judgment, I could see no reason why people say they were badly treated."

On page 27 another witness named Mtengwane Ludidi, after reciting complaints, gives his judgment in the matter. He says—

> "The labourers have no complaint about the food they are getting. The people were well paid when the Transvaal was under the Dutch"——

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL (Yorkshire, Cleveland): The right hon. Gentleman has left out an important sentence.

MR. LYTTELTON: I will read the whole. The labourers claim that their wages should be raised, and that those who fall sick should be allowed to go home, and that their friends should be allowed to take them—

> "The people were well paid when the Transvaal was under the Dutch, and now that the English, who are our friends, have rule, they should be paid better still. I say myself the wages of the labourers should be raised. The native Europeans and Zulu policemen should not be allowed to ill-treat and beat the labourers."

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL: I apologise for not having read that.

MR. LYTTELTON: I quite sympathise with hon. Members who interrupted me in the reading of that passage for in fact I was reading from the wrong page. I was reading the evidence of one of the witnesses for my hon. and gallant friend and not from a witness in support of the case I wish to put. I meant to read from page 32 instead of page 27. There we find the headman summing up his experience by saying—

> "Personally I was much satisfied with what I saw and learned at the Rand, and now am trying to induce labourers to go there, and at our monthly meeting here, at the request of our magistrate, gave a *résumé* of our journey

which I trust will have a beneficial result as soon as the men can leave after planting their crops which have been delayed on account of the drought."

I do not for a moment say that there were not allegations both ways; but in the dilemma well known to those who belong to my profession, when there is a conflict of evidence it is better to go by the judgment of the Judge, and I am perfectly prepared to abide by the broad terms of the decision Mr. Brownlee gave. In substance, without boring the House by reading extracts again, his general conclusion appears on page 7.

MAJOR SEELY: I read that.

MR. LYTTELTON: He says—

"The conclusion we arrive at is that generally the treatment is fairly good."

That is the general statement. I quite agree there were statements made by Mr. Brownlee in regard to payment of wages, of misrepresentations by the agents of the Labour Association. I was really astonished to find that hon. Members opposite who are well acquainted with trade unions failed to see the difference between an authorised agency and an unauthorised agent. The hon. Member who spoke just now did not deal with the point, but I was astonished that trade union Members, who have contended that a union should not be liable for the acts of its agents, failed to see it. It may be that individual members of the Labour Association, human nature being what it is, in eagerness to secure recruits, may have overstepped the bounds of fair representation—I daresay that may be—indeed complaints were made that it had been done. But I do not think it would have been possible for the Labour Association to do more than they did. You will find on page 17 the form of contract set forth. There is the name of the native, the name of his chief, and there is the agreement that he will proceed to Johannesburg to work in the mines for not less than six months at 1s. 8d. a day for surface work and 2s. for underground work. Nobody can pretend that at headquarters there was misrepresentation; an agent might give a rose colouring to the terms offered when trying to get a native to enter into an engagement; but all the people at headquarters could do was to draw up the form of contract and make the matter perfectly clear and to punish an agent when convicted of misrepresentation. This is the fair conclusion from Mr. Brownlee's Report, and he is in the position of Judge deciding between various parties giving evidence one against another. He is convinced that in certain cases native labourers were deceived by agents of the association; he does not say for a moment that every possible precaution was not taken by the Association. Mr. Brownlee makes no charge against the association, none whatever. I do not think there could be a clearer form of contract than is found here in the Blue-book. I do not think any fair-minded man in the House will say it is possible to make it more clear. More than that, a special regulation was passed whereby when a native enters Transvaal territory a passport is delivered to him, and no passport is given to a native to enable him to proceed until he has satisfied the British official who has charge of the passports that he understands the contract and knows what wages he is to receive. That is precaution on the top of precaution, and I do not know what more could be done. Mistakes, and worse than mistakes, there will be; but all that my Department had to do was to see that every precaution should be taken against fraud. But in that country, as in this and all countries, fraudulent people live and, I am sorry to say, sometimes thrive.

The only other matter which was dealt with by Mr. Brownlee in his Report, and in which he found there was legitimate cause for complaint, is where he speaks of the striking of native labourers by native overseers, who carry sjamboks, and from time to time used them in a manner unfortunately too common in that country. Nobody defends that for a moment. Let me point out this to the House. Of course cases of assault occur every day in this country by the hundred, but they are against the law and they are punished by the law when proved; and that is exactly the case in the Transvaal. Assaults made by native overseers on labourers working in the mines are against the law; they are punished when they are discovered. They have been the subject of prosecution on fourteen occasions in the past year, and in thirteen cases convictions were obtained. It has been enjoined on the mine-owners, though I do not think such an injunction was necessary, that they should be most vigilant in this matter, and I may say in connection with the enforcement of the law and the detection of breaches of the law that fourteen inspectors are engaged, and that in the course of one year nearly 10,000 visits of inspection were paid to the mines. Of course, we are all human and offences will arise; but I think I may put it to any fair-minded man that not much more can be done than to have a law against the thing and to provide a large number of inspectors to see that breaches of the law do not take place, and that when breaches of the law do take place prosecutions shall follow. These are really the only two matters in Mr. Brownlee's Report in which, sitting as a Judge, and hearing conflicting accounts of natives, he himself ventures to say that there is any serious ground of complaint whatever. Upon all other matters before him I think he fairly sums up the case when he says that the treatment is generally good. I agree that the fact that natives do not go to the mines in very great numbers proves to some extent that they do not like the service; but the Portuguese natives go in large numbers. I believe that 80 per cent. are Portuguese, and I am told that many of them re-enlist after the first year's service.

I fully agree that the mortality in the mines is a very grave matter; and obviously any matter that is considered grave by men like myself and the Members of this House is considered grave by a man of the high character and humane disposition of Lord Milner. I ventured to call Lord Milner's attention to the subject of the heavy mortality in the mines. I knew, of course, that the matter would be engaging his attention; but I ventured to call attention to it not long after I came into office. I asked him for his judgment upon it, and his telegram of 27th February, which would have been published, had my hon. friend been less impetuous, in the course of a week, is to this effect—

> "Your telegram of February 22. I entirely agree. The high rate of mortality in the mines is the weakest point in our armour."

[Ironical Opposition cheers.] Certainly. No mining work can ever be a healthy employment.

> "The death-rate ought to be enormously reduced. Very great efforts have been made lately in this direction. The majority of the mines have taken up the matter with energy."

So long ago as June, 1903, a Commission of doctors was appointed in the Transvaal, and they made a most valuable report, in which a number of most valuable suggestions were made, involving heavy expenditure on the mines, an expenditure which has generally been cheerfully undertaken. The improvements recommended by the medical officers have been very widely adopted, though not yet universally. Unfortunately the results are disappointing so far. The medical experts are, however, unanimous that improvements have been effected and must tell in time. Now, I want the House to note this when they are considering this difficult question. No doubt one reason of the recent high mortality is that, owing to the extreme scarcity of labour, the mines have been recruiting any labour they can get, whatever the physique of the men. I ask the House to pause there. Humane men on all sides must deplore this mortality. They must see that when the greatest possible efforts are made to get labour, and when the natives are anxious to come and earn money, there is a liability for men of inferior physique to be brought into the mines, with the result that this deplorable mortality continues. I deplore it. I am sure every man in the House deplores it. I think the mine-owners, when they see its effect, deplore it also. [Ironical Opposition cheers.] It seems to be a matter for merriment to the hon. Members oppsite. I think that most humane-minded men will feel that if the result of introducing Chinese labour is that men of full capacity and good health and good physique can replace these negroes, who come from tropical latitudes, and who for three months in the year, I am told, are practically unfit to work in the mines at all, on that ground alone, apart from other arguments which I have put forward on previous occasions, there is something to be said on the ground of humanity for the introduction of Chinese labour.

Now, I am happy to say that I am able to give to the House a more cheerful view with regard to this mortality, though I still admit that it is too heavy and ought to be diminished; and I believe it will be diminished as the result of the measures taken. The reports I have before me are not so deplorable as those quoted by my hon. and gallant friend. The Commissioner for Native Affairs in his annual Report dealing with the Commission of medical officers which was appointed to consider the question of mortality quotes their statement. It appears from it that the total annual death-rate, calculated on the basis of the aversge number of natives employed for six months, would be, not 90, but 57 per 1,000. Curiously enough, it appears that the death-rate among the natives employed in the Kimberley compounds, which are admitted to be admirably conducted, is practically identical—namely, 57·2 per 1,000 for the year 1902. Then there is a deduction to be made for accidents, which would put the rate at 54 per 1,000. I do not say that is satisfactory; but it is very much better than the figures given by my gallant friend, which I am unable to appreciate or understand. I cannot give the exact figures because they cannot be given, but I have been told by high authorities in this country who have come from South Africa—by the Bishop of Mashonaland for one, who is not friendly to the policy which I have had to advocate in this House—that the mortality in the kraals of the natives is enormously high. To compare, as was done by my hon. friend the Member for Oldham, the mortality among the miners, the picked labouring population of this country, with that in a climate which is not so healthy, and among a far more feeble and susceptible race, is not really to institute a fair comparison. But be that as it may, I called Lord Milner's attention to the subject most urgently, and the telegram which I have read to the House shows how fully he appreciated the fact that the mortality was too great and ought to be diminished No one can feel a doubt on the subject. If I only had the time, and the House had the patience, to digest this book, which is entirely composed of tables giving the answers to questions put by the Commissioners to natives in the Transvaal in all the mines, and the recorded answers, it would be seen what immense exertions have been made to carry out all the reforms which were suggested by the medical board and by Mr. Brownlee, and by every other scientific investigator whom they could consult.

In truth and in sincerity it is a pity this debate should have taken place. I assured my hon. friend that I would directly lay the Papers upon the Table, the book is in my hand, and it will be in the hands of hon. Members directly, before Saturday, when they will have ample opportunity, if they can find any holes in it, to criticise it. What I venture to deplore is that the time of the House should be occupied in discussing this matter when I believe no one in the House, except myself, is in possession of the whole case. I have spent all the time since the notice of this Motion in trying to get some summary of this book, which has only just been put into my hands; but I do not like to give the House my own impression of a document so hurriedly perused. I can only give the summary which is given substantially by the authorities in South Africa, who assert that the most sincere and most strenuous endeavours have been made by the mine authorities to put in force the requisitions that were made by the medical board and Mr. Brownlee, and that within the time that they have had to put those suggestions into force a really remarkably good result has been obtained. The death-rate in February was actually brought down to 35 per 1,000. I do not want the House to be misled; January and February are always good months, and, I think, March, in former years, when things were worse, the death-rate in February went down as low as 40 per 1,000. It is lower now than it has ever been before, however, and another good symptom is that for two months in succession there have been better records than previously. I do not think I can say much more, profitably, on the present occasion.

Mr. HALDANE (Haddingtonshire) asked whether the right hon. Gentleman could say what steps had been taken with regard to miners' phthisis, in view of the recommendation by Lord Milner's Commission as to working on the wet system.

MR. TENNANT (Berwickshire) asked what steps had been recommended in the mines.

MR. LYTTELTON: I wish I could give those details. I have spent all the time I could since the notice of this Motion was given in perusing this Blue-book. I frankly own I have not read the whole of it; and though I have read a good deal about pneumonia, and though the supply of blankets and proper clothing to the native labourers when they first come to bank and have to go from the mine to the compound strikes me as a very important measure, I am not able to tell the House with accuracy whether the recommendation as to the allaying of the fine dust in the mines, which I know is a source of danger to the lungs, has been carried out. During the last three or four months there has been really poignant distress among the community in the Transvaal, and acute anxiety; and I do ask the House to agree that, considering the enormous improvement which has been made, this is not the occasion for any assembly of Englishmen, without having seen the case which can be made, and which is made in these books, to pronounce one word of censure upon those whose case they have imperfectly apprehended, and who have been represented by me at a time when I was imperfectly informed.

*MR. JOHN ELLIS said that nobody would deny that they ought to thank the hon. Gentleman below the Gangway opposite for bringing this matter forward. The hon. and gallant Member for the Isle of Wight introduced the question in a speech of great moderation and ability. Having himself looked through the Cape Blue-book he could say the hon. Member was absolutely fair in the quotations which he had read from the Report. The hon. Member for Oldham had been also absolutely fair in the particulars with which he supported his arguments. Where-ever they sat he was sure that these two hon. Members would be distinguished ornaments of this Assembly. The right hon. Gentleman the Colonial Secretary had attempted to dispose of the case by quoting documents which were not before the House. That was the pity of the matter, and who was to blame for that? The right hon. Gentleman complained that the case had been brought on before the complete evidence necessary to arrive at a proper conclusion was forthcoming. His reply to that was that the Notice Paper contained a Motion relating to Chinese Labour in the mines which debarred any discussion upon that subject; and, if that evening had been allowed to pass without attention being called to the question of native labour generally, a blocking Motion would have appeared on the Notice Paper within the next few days, shutting out a Motion affecting the mortality and the treatment of the native labourers in the mines. The Colonial Secretary had dealt largely with the statement of Mr. Brownlee, who was, after all, a subordinate in the matter. The case had been summed up by Mr. Stamford, his superior in the following words—

> "The enquiry I think clearly establishes that misrepresentations with regard to wages are made by the labour agents, that occasionally wrongful deductions are made, assaults by European overseers and the native police are of frequent occurrence."

The right hon. Gentleman had not disposed of these two charges which amount to fraud and cruelty. The reports of the headmen in regard to these points were extremely strong. He had this to remark about the evidence of the natives: that it was a grievous pity that on every possible occasion the employer was present when the natives were questioned. These men ought to have been taken apart and encouraged freely to state what was in their minds. He contended when that was not done the evidence of these natives was vitiated. He was sorry that the right hon. Gentleman did not admit in his speech that there was a case for further inquiry.

The right hon. Gentleman had laid on the Table a belated Blue-book. As to his point that the information had only just been received, whose fault was that? He had been in communication with the Colonial Secretary on this matter so long ago as February last, and he wanted to ask why the right hon. Gentleman had not given the House some information on this matter before Easter? The Blue-book was dated December. Even the telegram quoted by the Colonial Secretary from Lord Milner was dated

February. The hon. Member for Oldham stated that the right hon. Member for West Birmingham had done one very good thing—he had diminished flogging throughout British territories. He had done something more. The right hon. Gentleman had sent out Sir Richard Martin to investigate the treatment of natives by the British South Africa Company in Rhodesia, and his Report had done much good. The Colonial Secretary ought, following the example of the right hon. Member for West Birmingham, to send out some person of high position and character, who was free of all associtíon with these mine-owners, who were not all our countrymen, to investigate the matter of the treatment of the labourers from top to bottom. They were all glad to hear that the terrible mortality was being reduced, but they ought to have a good deal more information as to what was going on in the mines of the Transvaal. He knew that the right hon. Gentleman regarded this question of labour with sentiments of humanity, but there were men on the spot who did not govern their conduct by such sentiments, and who regarded the natives as mere beasts of burden, hewers of wood, and drawers of water. One of them said—"They are hewers of wood and drawers of water and as nearly beasts of burden as it was possible to make a human animal into." He was there as a Member of the House of Commons speaking the sentiments of his constituents when he said they could not limit the aspirations of human beings in that way. Man was not made for gold; gold was made for man. The right hon. Gentleman in one of his interesting dissertations had declared that men were better than minerals. That was a very happy phrase and that was the spirit they wanted to see animating the Government in this matter. They wanted that wherever the British flag was flying such conditions of labour should be imposed as would reflect credit on the country and the Empire. He feared the right hon. Gentleman hardly even yet appreciated the gravity of the question and the feelings of his countrymen, irrespective of Party, as to the treatment of the natives in the gold mines, and therefore he rejoiced that the Motion had been brought forward, and he would go into the Lobby in favour of it with the greatest pleasure.

*MR. JOHN STROYAN said that having been associated with South Africa for a quarter of a century, and having lived in the country long before gold was known in it, he felt it his duty to make a few remarks. Quite unintentionally the position of the Witwatersrand Labour Association had been put before the House in a misleading light. It had been represented as a huge trust, an association to make money out of trafficking in the natives. It was nothing of the sort. The Native Labour Association was nothing more or less than a department of the Chamber of Mines, and was maintained at very considerable cost to the mines. He knew that the Native Labour Department had a good many enemies, and that they left no stone unturned to discredit it and to mislead the public as to its functions. Those enemies were the former native agents, touts who had been displaced by the association and who in consequence were now trying to disparage it. As a matter of fact it became absolutely necessary to form this association, so that the native should be honestly treated. Generally speaking, he asserted that the native received fairplay, and was told exactly what his wages and treatment would be. They had heard a good deal about the deplorable mortality but he was glad to find that the native mortality was being lessened, and the Native Labour Department had done most excellent service in this direction. He himself had seen thousands of natives come down to the mines for the winter from Portuguese territory and even from further north. They arrived in a half-starved miserable condition in the middle of the winter season, which rendered them—coming as they did from tropical climes—peculiarly susceptible to pneumonia. Hence the severe death-rate among them. But the Native Labour Department had arranged for half-way houses and shelters for the natives on their way to and from the Rand. Food and shelter were provided, so as to enable the natives to arrive in good condition on the Rand, thereby making them less susceptible to attacks from pneumonia than had been the case in the past.

He had known South Africa for twenty-five years; until eight or ten years ago he was intimately associated with mining work on the Rand, and was managing director of mines which employed large numbers of labourers. Their greatest trouble was to get natives and then to retain them; but it was an element of self-interest with those connected with the mines to see that the native was well treated. The native was like a child; if he were discontented and considered that he was being badly treated no amount of money would tempt him to stay in the mines. The mines were managed by British and American engineers, and he had yet to learn that the Briton was less humane abroad than he was in this country. The greatest care was also taken in the selection of the compound manager, who, among his varied qualifications, was expected to know the different native languages and customs. The compound manager was invariably an English colonist born and brought up in South Africa. It was essential that a mine should have a good name among the natives and it was equally necessary to also have a good man. If he treated them badly, or was unpopular with them, he was not allowed to remain long in the mine. They had heard a great deal about flogging and ill-treatment, but he had never known of a case of flogging on the Rand. On the contrary, there were hospitals where the natives were treated with every attention and kindness, and on his visit to Witwatersrand last year he was pleased to see what immense progress had been made in rendering the condition of the people more comfortable. They were excellently housed, and when sick were well nursed. They had heard many fairy tales in the past and he anticipated they would hear them in the future. But he had thought that the improved travelling facilities which now existed would have been more taken advantage of by the general public to see for themselves what was going on in South Africa. Many people had, indeed, gone out to that country during and since the war but he certainly was disappointed that the actual position of the mining industry was not better understood in this country.

*MR. HERBERT SAMUEL said the hon. Member had painted a very rosy picture of the mines in the Transvaal. Apparently he had not read the Blue-book.

MR. JOHN STROYAN: I have only just got it.

*MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: Then it is all the more astonishing he should make the statements he did.

MR. JOHN STROYAN: I spoke from personal experience.

*MR. HERBERT SAMUEL said that might be so, but the hon. Member's statements flew in the face of every page of the Blue-book. The hon. Member had told them that self-interest—if no higher motive—induced the mine-owners to treat the labourers with humanity and decency, yet by the Labour Ordinance they were going to import Chinese, and would thus remove the motive of self-interest by rendering them independent of the Kaffirs, whether they were contented or not. No doubt many of the mine-owners and managers in the Transvaal were honestly desirous to do all in their power to improve the conditions under which the Kaffirs worked in the mines, but the fact remained that the efforts hitherto made in that direction had proved quite ineffective, and there was a damning indictment to be found on every page of the Blue-book which had been circulated that day. The Colonial Secretary had stated that the hon. Member for the Isle of Wight had shown a glimpse of fairness in quoting the statement of Mr. Brownlee, but what would be thought of the fairness of the Colonial Secretary in reading passages from the Blue-book and yet omitting from them vital sentences because they did not suit his purpose, which he only subsequently read when called upon to do so by interruptions from that side. And the right hon. Gentleman had quoted the evidence of a headman—Jerry Bangani—who was a labour recruiter himself. This man, since the outbreak of the war, had supplied some 900 labourers to the De Beers mines and for other works, and he had admitted that since the cessation of hostilities he had failed in his endeavours to obtain labourers for the Rand mines, because the natives were afraid of bad treatment and bad food and of the method in which they were crowded in railway trucks to be sent to the mines.

Mr. LYTTELTON: If I had read that passage I should have thought it right to read it also to the House. But this debate came on suddenly, and I have not had time to read all the Blue-book.

*Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL gladly and fully accepted the right hon. Gentleman's explanation. But the fact remained that this man's evidence was the only evidence in the Book which gave unqualified praise to the conditions in the mines. Mr. Brownlee said that the treatment of the natives was generally good. But he declared that flogging was frequent and that compound managers were accustomed without trial to imprison native labourers. He also said that some of the hospitals were small and provided little comfort for the patients; that many natives were called upon to do thirty-two days' work for thirty days' pay; that they frequently did not get the pay that they were promised when they were enlisted. If that was treatment which was generally good what would be treatment which was "generally bad"? Then they had the evidence of Mr. Stamford, the magistrate, which was to the effect that inquiries had clearly established misrepresentations by labour agents as to wages, wrongful deductions, and an unintelligible system of calculating time. He added, "the wages paid are undoubtedly less than before the war," and that as long as the native could obtain more remunerative work elsewhere, the supply for the mines was not likely to be augmented. Other extracts from the Blue-book showed that the natives were not allowed one day's rest a week; that they were bullied and thrashed by the Zulu police; that they were fined for small offences by subordinate white officials; that they were not allowed to go home when ill; and that they did not know the inspectors who were appointed to protect their interests. And a still more extraordinary passage was that in which it was stated that some of the natives, after serving a period in gaol, to which they had been sentenced by the stipendiary magistrates for a trifling offence, were not granted passes to enable them to seek employment elsewhere, but their services were sold for a period of six months to any agent who liked to buy them, and the men were compelled to undertake labour contrary to their will and health. If this were true, forced labour was added to the sentence of imprisonment. He had, when going through the Blue-book, marked the passages giving evidence of cases of ill-treatment and on going through the Blue-book again he found that there was not a single page of the book, except the few devoted to formal statements of contracts, and so forth, which did not contain marked passages. Here there was an ample explanation as to why the mine-owners were unable to get sufficient labour; and he thought that the hon. Gentlemen who opposed the proposals of the right hon. Gentleman had been absolutely justified in their action. There was one matter the Blue-book did not deal with, and that was the question of ventilation. It was owing to the neglect of ventilation, the overcrowding of the compounds, and the insufficiency of the hospital accommodation, that the abnormally high death-rate was due. He wondered if the House realised that, if this death-rate applied to the new labourer as it did to the old, out of every 10,000 Chinese only 6,000 would survive at the expiration of six years' period of service. If 4,000 troops out of 10,000 were slaughtered in a battle in the present war it would be regarded as an unprecedented holocaust. Yet this was the death-rate to which men engaged in a peaceful industry were exposed. The mine-owners ought to put their house in order, then they would get labour enough. The policy of the Government was to save the mine-owners from the effects of their folly by introducing a fresh supply of labour. Rarely had a case been more completely riddled by criticism and destroyed by facts than the case of the Government in this matter of Transvaal labour, and he thought that the disclosures they had heard that night had completed the work of exposure.

*Mr. BELL (Derby) said he wished to say a few words in support of the Motion. The answer of the Colonial Secretary had not satisfied him. Like some other Members of the House he was speaking without having seen the Blue-book which his hon. friend and the mover and seconder of the Motion had had the privilege of seeing; but the extracts they had read were sufficient to satisfy him, at any rate, that there existed in the Transvaal a great deal of cruelty. The Colonial Secretary, in his reply, had not in any way denied the facts as stated by the mover and seconder. He had been surprised by what he had heard from both sides of the House during the course of the discussion, particularly from the hon. Member opposite, who defended the conditions in the Transvaal with an ability which almost inclined him to resign his position in this country and see if he could not get a job in the Transvaal. The hon. Member put such a glorious aspect upon labour in the Transvaal that it must be a great temptation to the people of this country. He himself, and several other speakers, had recognised that there was a great deal of human nature about the natives. He had been unable to discover that there was anything in the black man that was not contained in the white man in this country. It seemed to him that the natives were not bad trade-unionists after all. The chief complaint and grievance was that they refused to work for half the wages that formerly were paid for the same kind of work, and if similar tactics were tried in this country it would be found that even a British workman would not accept a reduction of from 30 per cent. to 50 per cent. in his wages, in the manner in which the natives had been compelled to accept, and he was positive that he would not tolerate the treatment from employers here that was meted out by employers in the mines in South Africa. But the peculiarity of the whole statement of the case related to the Native Labour Association. He was very familiar with the Free Labour Association in this country. It was managed in exactly a similar way. The recruiting agents were paid so much per head for the number of hands that they were able to provide for the employers when a dispute existed. If there was anything that aroused him it was the exploiting of labour for the greed of profit. He had endeavoured, he endeavoured now, and he hoped he should continue to endeavour, to regard and consider the claims and rights of employers equally as much as the claims and rights of labour in all questions he had to deal with; and he believed that he had been given some little credit for endeavouring to be fair in matters of this kind. Whilst he desired to do that which was fair between employer and workman he was bound to confess that any such conduct as that described in the Blue-book would be the very kind of conduct that would arouse his spirit, and lead him to favour a rising up against any such treatment by employers in this country, even if such action entailed the loss of the whole of the funds of the trade-unions. As the right hon. Gentleman the Colonial Secretary had frequently referred to "our fellow-countrymen in the Transvaal," he supposed they must regard the natives as their fellow-countrymen as much as some of these Rand mine-owners, to whom the right hon. Gentleman also referred as fellow-countrymen. He was ready to stand up in defence of fairplay and justice for his fellow-countrymen, whether black, white, or yellow, whether Church of England, Catholic, or Nonconformists, in this or any other part of the Empire. They had made sacrifices in order that these people for whom they were speaking that night should be made fellow-countrymen, and having made those sacrifices both in money and flesh and blood, this House ought to go out of its way to defend and protect them from injustice and hardships such as they complained of.

He observed from statements made from one hon. Member that when the evidence was collected from some of the labourers it was obtained in the presence of the employer. That was a very improper way of collecting evidence. He knew from experience in this country that with evidence obtained in that way, however impartial or however fair the person might be soliciting it, or however fair the employer might be, however anxious he might be that the men should have free and full liberty to say what they desired to say, yet with evidence obtained in such a way there was a suspicion and a tendency on the part of the labourer not to say that which he desired to say owing to the presence of his employer. Whilst they found that in this country, how much more likely was it that there would be a tendency of that sort on the part of the men subject to such ill-treatment as the natives were on the Rand. He hoped that the discussion that night would have the desired effect, and that the Colonial Secretary would not stay his hand until he had put a stop absolutely and completely to any such treatment as had been referred to. The manner in which the contracts of these men were broken by the employers was bad enough; but to be treated as it was reported they were treated, was unfair and very unjust; and he thought it was not very much to the credit, if it was not to the shame, of the British House of Commons to tolerate it. He was bound to refer to a statement of the Colonial Secretary with regard to his desire that the debate should not take place before the Blue-book was published. The right hon. Gentleman had read a telegram, dated the 27th February, and he was particularly struck with the fact that the House had not been acquainted with that telegram. That could not be on the ground that there was not sufficient time. He understood also that the Blue-book which his hon. friends had been quoting from that night was dated last December. He did not know how long it was since the Colonial Secretary obtained possession of a copy; but presumably the right hon. Gentleman would be about the first person in this country to be supplied with a copy of it. If such were the case, there was no reason at all why the House should not have been in possession of the whole of the facts long before now. He presumed there must have been a reason for that; and the reason was that they wanted the other discussion with regard to labour in South Africa cleared out of the way before giving the House all the facts contained in the Blue-book they were now discussing. That being the case he held that the hon. Member who brought on the Motion was perfectly justified in doing so; and he hoped the House would mark its feeling in regard to this matter by supporting it.

Mr. SEELY (Lincoln) said the Colonial Secretary complained that the Motion was not reasonable, as it was brought forward before the full facts and figures were before the House. The real reason for urgency was this: the Motion dealt with facts that had only just come to the knowledge of the House with regard to these labourers. The Colonial Secretary was proposing to bring a large number of men 10,000 miles across the sea to work these mines, and the question how they were going to be treated when they got there was one which affected not only their health and comfort but the honour and good name of this country. The facts brought out did establish a considerable *prima facie* case as to there being grave doubts whether the natives were properly treated. The facts quoted by the Colonial Secretary hardly supported his own case, and it seemed to him that the wisest course for the right hon. Gentleman to adopt was to delay the importation of these Chinese labourers.

*Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Gentleman is now entering on a question which is not before the House. He can only discuss the actual treatment of the natives in this particular mine.

Mr. SEELY said he wished to point out the reason for urgency.

*Mr. SPEAKER: That was a matter which I and the House had to consider when I put to the House the question of leave. When that Question has been put to the House no question of urgency can afterwards arise.

Mr. SEELY said he agreed with the Speaker's ruling. The gravest element in the whole question related to the death-rate of these labourers. According to the Colonial Secretary the death-rate had been 57 per 1,000, but it had been reduced to 35. But, according to information his hon. relative possessed, the average death-rate was 80 per 1,000 per annum. Speaking as one of the largest mine-owners in the country, he said that such a death-rate was a discredit to the engineers and those who were concerned in the industry on the Witwatersrand, and it was the duty of the Colonial Secretary to see not only that everything was done to remedy such a state of things by engineering care and skill, but that no man was brought to these mines and compounds without full knowledge of the conditions under which they would live, and that they should be told that their chance of life was only twelve short years. The seriousness of the question must be obvious to every hon. Member, and it should be the duty of the House to insist on the Government dealing with the grave matters which had been disclosed.

MR. CREMER (Shoreditch, Haggerston) said he understood the hon. Member for West Perthshire to state in his personal experience that none of the practices referred to by the hon. Member who introduced the Motion existed during the time he resided in the Transvaal. He wished to know whether the hon. Gentleman's experience was recent or not.

MR. JOHN STROYAN said he was referring to eight years ago. He had, however, visited the Rand three times since then and found the same condition of affairs as he had described.

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 150; Noes, 213. (Division List No. 115.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Asher, Alexander
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Bell, Richard
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Cullinan J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Ellice, CaptEC(SAndrew'sBghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, SirFrancisH(Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Ffrench, Peter
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Gilhooly, James
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grey,Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchhill
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hammond, John
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutchinson, Dr. CharlesFredk.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kilbride, Denis
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leamy, Edmund
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mooney, John J.
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien,Kendal(Tipperary,Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow,W.
O'Dowd, John
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roche, John
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, RtHn.C.R.(Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C.(Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas,DavidAlfred(Merthyr)
Tomkinson, James
Ure, Alexander
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E.R,)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.
Woodhouse,SirJ T.(Huddersf'd
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Major Seely and Mr. Churchill.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster,Rt.Hn.HughC.
Arrol, Sir William
Bagot, Capt.Josceline FitzRoy

Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt.Hon.A.J. (Manch'r
Balfour,Rt.Hn.GeraldW(Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Bousfield, William Robert
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brown, Sir Alex. H. (Shropsh.)
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Campbell, J.H.M.(DublinUniv.
Cavendish, V.C.W.(Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain,RtHn.J.A.(Worc.
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig,Charles Curtis(Antrim,S.
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies, SirHoratioD.(Chatham
Dickson, Charles Scott
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dimsdale, Rt.Hon.SirJosephC.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt.Hon.SirWilliamHart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.
Fergusson,Rt.Hn.SirJ.(Manc'r
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
FitzGerald, Sir RobertPenrose-
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Forster, Henry William
Foster, PhilipS.(Warwick,S.W.
Fyler, John Arthur
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gore,HnG.R. C.Ormsby-(Salop
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D.(Shrewsbury)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Groves, James Grimble
Hamilton, Marq. of(L'nd'derry
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th
Harris, Dr. Fredk. R. (Dulwich
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath,Arthur Howard (Hanley
Heath, James (Staffords,N.W.)
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A.(Stafford, W.
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard,John(KentFaversham
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hozier, Hon.JamesHenry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys,Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Kennaway,Rt.Hon.Sir John H.
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W.(Salop.
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Knowles, Sir Lees
Labouchere, Henry
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lee,ArthurH.(Hants.,Fareham
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, FrederickN.S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Lone, Col.Charles W.(Evesham
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Bristol,S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowther,C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas,ReginaldJ.(Portsmouth)
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Calmont, Colonel James
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell,Rt.HnSirH.E.(Wigt'n
Maxwell,W.J.H(Dumfriesshire
Middlemore,JohnThrogmorton
Milner,Rt.Hon.SirFrederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu,Hon. J. Scott(Hants.
Moore, William
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morton, Arthur H. Alymer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Rt.HnA.Graham(Bute
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, HerbertPike(Darlington
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Plummer, Walter R.
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Reid, James (Greenock)
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, Hon.M.W.(Stalybridge
Ridley, S.Forde(Bethnal Green
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rothschild, Hon LionelWalter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Saunderson, Rt.Hn.Col.Edw.J.
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford, East
Smith, James Parker(Lanarks.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Hon. Arthur(Ormskirk
Stanley,EdwardJas.(Somerset)
Stanley, Rt.Hon.Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, SirMark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent,Col.SirC.E.H(Sheffield
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, RtHon.SirWilliamH.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby,Lt.-Col.A.C.E.(Taunton
Wharton, Rt. Hon.John Lloyd
Whiteley, H.(Ashtonund.Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson-Todd,SirW.H.(Yorksh.
Wodehouse, Rt.Hn.E.R.(Bath)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C.B.Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

Adjourned at fourteen minutes after Twelve o'clock.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Friday, 6th May, 1904.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with:—Local Government Provisional Order (Poor Law).

And also the Certificate that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with:—Humber Commercial Railway and Dock.

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

Lord Tredegar's Supplemental Estate Bill [H.L.]. Judges' Report received; Bill presented, and read 1^a.

Mullingar, Kells, and Drogheda Railway Bill; Thurles Urban District Council Water Bill. Read 2^a, and committed.

Metropolitan District Railway Bill [H.L.]; Llanelly Harbour Bill [H.L.]; St. Bartholomew's Hospital Bill [H.L.]. Read 3^a, and passed, and sent to the Commons.

Sutton Gas Bill; Bishop's Stortford and District Gas Bill. Read 3^a, and passed.

Kettering Improvement Bill. Read 3^a, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill. Brought from the Commons; read 1^a; and referred to the Examiners.

Ipswich Dock Commission Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments.

Hampton-in-Arden Gas Bill. Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to.

Metropolitan Police Provisional Order Bill. To be read 2^a on Monday next. (The Lord Belper.)

Metropolitan Common Scheme (Hillingdon East) Provisional Order Bill; Metropolitan Common Scheme (Farnborough) Provisional Order Bill. House in Committee (according to Order); Bills reported without Amendment; Standing Committee negatived; and Bills to be read 3^a on Monday next.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [H.L.]; Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill [H.L.]. Read 2^a (according to order).

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

MALTA.

Further correspondence relating to the political condition of Malta (in continuation of [Cd. 1660], July, 1903).

CENSUS OF IRELAND, 1901.

General Topographical Index.

AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS (IRELAND).

Return of the prices of agricultural products and live stock, for the year 1903.

TRANSVAAL.

Correspondence relating to conditions of Native labour employed in Transvaal mines.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

VICTORIA.

1. Electoral Districts Boundaries Act, 1903. No. 1895. 2. Electoral Provinces Boundaries Act, 1903. No. 1896.

POLICE ACT, 1890.

Correspondence relative to the refusal of the Secretary of State's certificate, under Section 17 (2) of the Act, to the River Tyne Police Force, for the year ended 29th September, 1903.

HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES ACT, 1890 (THE LONDON (PROVIDENCE PLACE, POPLAR) IMPROVEMENT SCHEME, 1890).

Statement of modifications permitted by the Secretary of State for the Home Department to be made in the details of the London (Providence Place, Poplar) Improvement Scheme, 1901.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (IRELAND).

Two Orders with respect to the Urban County Districts of Bangor and Ballymena.

SUPERANNUATION.

Treasury minute, dated 2nd May, 1904, granting a retired allowance to Henry Edwards, Preventive Officer (Lower Section), London, Customs, under Section 2 of the Superannuation Act, 1887.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

THE ROYAL NAVAL RESERVE.

LORD MUSKERRY: My Lords, I rise to ask His Majesty's Government what are the necessary qualifications for a commandership on the active list of the Royal Naval Reserve, and what is to be the full complement of Royal Naval Reserve officers of this grade; whether it is intended to act upon the recommendation of the Naval Reserves Committee that the number of Royal Naval Reserve executive officers be increased, and, if so, to what extent; also, whether, if making such an increase, some relaxation cannot be made in regard to the present age limit, in order that the services of many desirable officers of the merchant service who otherwise would be ineligible may be availed of. I trust that the noble Earl the First Lord of the Admiralty will see his way to extend the age limit a little. There are very many able officers in the merchant service who are anxious to join the Royal Naval Reserve, but who find it impossible to attain the necessary qualifications before the present age limit. A slight extension would enable them to do so. Before resuming my seat I should like to inform my noble friend how highly appreciated by the officers of the Reserve is his action in instituting the new rank of commander.

*THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (The Earl of SELBORNE): The qualifications for the promotion of lieutenants, Royal Naval Reserve, to the rank of commander in the Reserve are as follows:—(*a*) The officer must have been through twelve months naval training and have received very good reports for conduct and ability; (*b*) he must have held command of a British ocean-going passenger steamer of not less than 4,000 tons gross for a period of three years; (*c*) he must have ten years seniority as a lieutenant, Royal Naval Reserve; (*d*) he must be under fifty-five years of age if he held a commission as lieutenant on 8th February, 1896,or under fifty years of age if he were promoted to lieutenant with seniority subsequent to that date. The Board of Admiralty reserve to themselves the power of promoting officers to the rank of commander, Royal Naval Reserve, if they are considered deserving of advancement on account of specially good service, although they may not have all the necessary qualifications as defined above. The maximum number of commanders, Royal Naval Reserve, is fixed by Order in Council of 7th March, 1904, at fifty. The Treasury were informed, however, that this number would not be reached for a considerable period, as it was intended to promote fifteen lieutenants only during the current year, and in future years only specially desirable and deserving candidates. The number for the present financial year—fifteen—now has been completed. Of the lieutenants promoted, fourteen possessed the qualifications laid down above, while the other officer was promoted for especially good service, although not possessing all the qualifications referred to. The Naval Reserves Committee recommended that the establishment of lieutenants, sub-lieutenants, and midshipmen, Royal Naval Reserve, should be increased considerably, the increase to be completed by the year 1909. After consideration of the Committee's recommendation, the Treasury were informed that their Lordships proposed to consider the subject afresh before recommending a definite establishment of Royal Naval Reserve officers, to which entries should be adjusted in the intervening years. In the meantime power was obtained to raise the number of executive officers from 1,550 to 1,600, the addition to include officers of the new rank of commander. The present age limits were very deliberately chosen, and I do not think there is any possibility of their being extended. The fact is there are many more applicants for these commissions than there are commissions to give away—a very happy state of affairs, but one that necessarily involves the result that many deserving officers are unable to obtain them. An extension of the age would only still further enlarge the field of selection and give rise to still further disappointments.

THE WHITSUNTIDE RECESS.

EARL SPENCER asked the Marquess of Lansdowne whether he could inform the House what he proposed to do about the Whitsuntide holidays.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (The Marquess of LANSDOWNE): It has been suggested to me that we might adjourn on the same day as the other House of Parliament, namely, the 19th inst., and that we should meet again on Tuesday, 7th June. I hope that will meet your Lordships' convenience.

House adjourned at twenty minutes before Five o'clock, to Monday next, a quarter before Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 6th May, 1904.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).

MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz.:—Ebbw Vale Urban District Water Bill [Lords]; Manchester Ship Canal (Finance) Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time.

Great Eastern Railway (Steamboats) Bill. Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Doncaster Corporation Bill. Read the third time, and passed.

Huddersfield Corporation Act, 1902 (Amendment) Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Strabane, Raphoe, and Convoy Railway Bill (King's Consent signified). Bill read the third time, and passed.

Surrey Commercial Dock Bill. Read the third time, and passed.

Crystal Palace District Gas Bill; Gosport Water Bill [Lords]; Metropolitan Railway Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

Tottenham Improvement Bill; West Metropolitan Railway (Abandonment) Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9). Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to Bolton, Congleton, Keighley, Newton-in-Makerfield, Oswestry, and Wisbech, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Grant Lawson and Mr. Walter Long.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill. "To confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to Bolton, Congleton, Keighley, Newton-in-Makerfield, Oswestry, and Wisbech," presented, and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 182.]

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10). Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to Chiswick, East Ham, Great Crosby, and York, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Grant Lawson and Mr. Walter Long.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill. "To confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to Chiswick, East Ham, Great Crosby, and York," presented, and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 183.]

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11). Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to Guildford, New Sarum, and the County of Wilts, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Grant Lawson and Mr. Walter Long.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill. "To confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to Guildford, New Sarum, and the county of Wilts," presented, and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 184.]

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 12). Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the Ashton-under-Lyne and District, the Congleton and District, and the Wath, Swinton, and District Joint Hospital Districts, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Grant Lawson and Mr. Walter Long.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 12) Bill. "To confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the Ashton-under-Lyne and District, the Congleton and District, and the Wath, Swinton, and District Joint Hospital Districts," presented, and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 185.]

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 13). Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to Blackpool, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Tynemouth, and Wigan, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Grant Lawson and Mr. Walter Long.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 13) Bill. "To confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to Blackpool, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Tynemouth, and Wigan," presented, and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 186.]

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 3). Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board for Ireland relating to Castlerea (Rural), Midleton (Rural), North Dublin (Rural), and Westport, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland and Mr. Wyndham.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill. "To confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board for Ireland relating to Castlerea (Rural), Midleton (Rural), North Dublin (Rural), and Westport," presented, and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 187.]

Elysée Palace Hotel Company Bill [Lords]. Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—Wellington (Somerset) Gas Bill, with Amendments.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confer further powers on the Clyde Valley Electrical Power Company; and for other purposes." [Clyde Valley Electrical Power Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confer further powers upon the Metropolitan District Railway Company; and for other purposes." [Metropolitan District Railway Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intitled, "An Act to change the name of the Llanelly Harbour and Burry Navigation Commissioners to the Llanelly Harbour Trust and to alter the constitution of the Trust; to revive and extend the powers for the compulsory purchase of lands and for the execution of works under the Llanelly Harbour Acts, 1896 and 1901, and otherwise amend those Acts; to empower the Trust to borrow moneys with the consent of the Urban District Council of Llanelly and otherwise to alter and extend the financial powers of the Trust; and for other purposes." [Llanelly Harbour Bill [Lords.]

And, also, a Bill, intitled, "An Act to empower the Governors of Saint Bartholomew's Hospital, in the city of London, to demolish the Church of Saint Bartholomew the Less and to use the site thereof and the burial ground adjoining thereto for the purposes of the said Hospital and for uniting for ecclesiastical purposes the parish of Saint Bartholomew the Less with the parish of Saint Bartholomew the Great; and for other purposes." [St. Bartholomew's Hospital Bill [Lords.]

Clyde Valley Electrical Power Bill [Lords]; Metropolitan District Railway Bill [Lords]; Llanelly Harbour Bill [Lords]; St. Bartholomew's Hospital Bill [Lords]. Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill. Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table. Bill to be read the third time upon Monday next.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill. Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Orders confirmed); Report to lie upon the Table. Bill, as amended, to be considered upon Monday next.

Brymbo Water Bill; North Western Electricity and Power Gas Bill; Nuneaton and Chilvers Coton Urban District Council Bill [Lords]; Harlow and Sawbridgeworth Gas Bill [Lords]; Cambrian Railways Bill [Lords]. Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions for alteration; from Fraserburgh; and Dingwall; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL..

Petition from Cathcart, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

ELECTIONS (HOURS OF POLLING).

Petition from Hackney, for alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table.

LAND VALUES TAXATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Cathcart, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

LANDS VALUATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Cathcart, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

LICENCES (RENEWAL).

Petitions against alteration of Law; from Hanley (two); Stockport (five); Higher Tranmere; Everton; Nelson; Burslem (two); Liverpool; Enfield; Horsham (seven); Fenny Stratford (two); Hackney; Southampton; Wallsend on Tyne; Sunderland; Bolton; Cambridge; Brighton; Summertown; Allendale; Walton; Parton; Hove; Highgate Hill; Tiverton; Holloway; Manchester; and Bucknall; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSED PREMISES (HOURS OF CLOSING).

Petition from Hackney, for alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions against; from Brixham; Gillingham; Paignton; New Southgate; Kennington; Liverpool; Kilmaurs; Choppington; East Ham; Halstead; Stepney; Calne; Staines; Northumberland; Birkenhead; Conway; Alnwick; Westminster; Newcastle; Nottingham; Victoria Docks; Halton le Gate; Dinnington; Leominster; Congregational Union of Scotland; Truro; Backworth; Forest Gate; City Road; and Temperance Committee of the Independent Methodist Churches; to lie upon the Table.

LIQUOR TRAFFIC LOCAL VETO (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Cathcart, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (SCOTLAND) ACT (1894) AMENDMENT BILL.

Petition from Cathcart, against; to lie upon the Table.

MINES (EIGHT HOURS) BILL.

Petition of the Scottish Trade Protection Society, against; to lie upon the Table.

RE-VACCINATION BILL.

Petition from Royal Leamington Spa, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF BUTTER BILL.

Petition from Stamford, against; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

CENSUS OF IRELAND, 1901.

Copy presented, of Census of Ireland, 1901 (General Topographical Index) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Return of Prices of Agricultural Products and Live Stock for the year 1903 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Two Orders of the Local Government Board for Ireland with respect to the Urban County Districts of Bangor and Ballymena [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

TRANSVAAL.

Copy presented, of Correspondence relating to Conditions of Native Labour employed in Transvaal Mines [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1887.

Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 2nd May, 1904, granting to Henry Edwards, Preventive Officer (Lower Section), London, Customs, a Retired Allowance under the Act [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

POLICE ACT, 1890.

Copy presented, of Correspondence relative to the refusal of the Secretary of State's Certificate under Section 17 (2) of the Act to the River Tyne Police Force for the year ended 29th September, 1903 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES ACT, 1890.

Copy presented, of Statement of modifications permitted by the Secretary of State for the Home Department to be made in the details of the London (Providence Place, Poplar) Improvement Scheme, 1901 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Medical Staff of Meath Hospital—Election to Vacancies.

MR. CLANCY (Dublin County, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the fact that the medical staff of the Meath Hospital (County Dublin Infirmary) claim the right to elect to vacancies in their own body, and that this right is claimed by the members of the staff elected since the passing of the Local Government Act, 1898, as well as by those in office before that date, he can state if it has been actually exercised on any occasion since 1898 by members of the staff elected since that date; and whether any representations have been received in reference to this matter from the Infirmary Committee.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) Two gentlemen were elected to the medical staff of this hospital since the passing of the Act of 1898 by the Medical Board under the 55 Geo. III. The answer to the last query is in the negative.

County Court Judges' Deputies.

MR. BRYNMOR JONES (Swansea District): To ask Mr. Attorney-General whether, seeing that when a Judge of County Courts in England and Wales is unable, owing to illness or domestic affliction, to hold his Courts in person on the appointed days the expense of obtaining a deputy Judge under The County Courts Act, 1888, falls upon him, he will say whether a like obligation is imposed on other judicial officers of the Crown; and whether he can see his way to recommend that steps be taken to give relief to Judges of County Courts from this obligation.

(*Answered by Sir Robert Finlay.*) I think my hon. and learned friend will find that in those cases in the judical service where a person may act by deputy he has to provide for the deputy himself. The matter will be brought under the consideration of the Lord Chancellor and the Treasury, but I cannot say that any change will be made in the direction indicated in the Question.

Postal Facilities between London and Paris.

Mr. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that letters for England can be posted in Paris in the trains conveying the mails up to the moment of departure without extra fee, whereas in London these letters can only be posted in the station letter boxes which are cleared a quarter of an hour before the departure of the train, on the payment on week-days of a late fee of 4d.; and, if so, will he state what reason there is for this difference of treatment, and why the arrangements cannot be the same in the two countries.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) It is, I believe, the fact that letters for England can be posted in the station letter boxes at Paris up to the moment of departure without late fee; but the hon. Member is mistaken in thinking that similar letters for France must be posted at least a quarter of an hour before the departure of the train, as they can be posted in the box attached to the platform barrier at Cannon Street Station up to 9 p.m., or in the mail carriage up to the moment of departure. The late fee is charged, not for revenue purposes but in order to limit the number of letters so posted, as there is reason to think that there would otherwise be so many that the sorters, whose work is already very heavy, would have serious difficulty in dealing with them in the mail carriages during the short run from London to Dover.

Employment of Rural Postmen on Extra Postal Duties in their Spare Time.

Mr. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): To ask the Postmaster General whether there is any official regulation or rule prohibiting a rural postman, on fixed wages of 16s. per week, being regularly employed in his spare time as an assistant to a sub-postmaster.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) There is no general rule on the subject. If the assistance rendered is in the sub-postmaster's official duty it would depend upon the circumstances of the case whether it could be allowed. If the hon. Member will give me particulars of the case to which he refers I will have inquiry made on the subject.

Annual Cost of Maintenance in Commission of a First-Class Battleship.

Mr. HARCOURT (Lancashire, Rossendale): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he can state the average annual cost of a first-class line of battleship in commission, for salaries of officers and crew, victualling, coal stores and repairs, and powder and ammunition respectively.

(*Answered by Mr. Pretyman.*) The average annual cost of maintaining in commission a first-class battleship of, say, 13,000 tons, is, approximately, as follows:—Full pay, wages, etc., of officers and crew, £40,369; victualling, £14,604; coal, £23,600; stores and repairs, £9,548; naval ordnance stores, £5,500; or, in round figures, a total cost of, £94,000.

Licences Refused—Position of Licensee as to existing Covenants.

Mr. GRETTON (Derbyshire, S.); To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he can state what will be the position of persons holding long leases of premises the licences of which are taken away, under the Licensing Bill, in regard to the existing covenants in such leases undertaken by the leaseholder in consideration of the premises being licensed; and would the leaseholder for the remainder of the term continue liable for the full rent he agreed to pay for the premises as licensed premises.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) It seems to me that the position of leaseholders of premises of which the licences may be extinguished under the Bill will not differ (except in so far as they may receive compensation) from the position of leaseholders in similar circumstances under the existing law, and will depend in each case on the terms of the lease. If the lease were accurately drawn, the covenants entered into by the tenant in consideration of the premises being licensed would, I suppose, be expressed so as to be operative only so long as the premises were licensed. If, however, it appears in discussion of the Bill that further provision on this point is desirable, an amendment can be considered.

Population of Local Education Authorities in Wales and Monmouthshire.

MR. J. H. LEWIS (Flint Boroughs): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether he can state what is the population of every local education authority in Wales and Monmouthshire.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) The population within the areas of the local education authorities in Wales and Monmouthshire according to the census of 1901, is as follows:—County Councils—Monmouth, 187,867; Anglesey, 50,606; Brecon, 54,213; Cardigan, 61,078; Carmarthen, 99,686; Carnarvon, 114,380; Denbigh, 116,616; Flint, 81,485; Glamorgan, 270,574; Merioneth, 48,852; Montgomery, 54,901; Pembroke, 72,041; Radnor, 23,281. County Borough Councils — Newport, 67,270; Cardiff, 164,333; Swansea, 94,537. Borough Councils—Carmarthen, 10,025; Neath, 13,720; Pembroke, 15,853; Wrexham, 14,966. Urban District Councils—Abertillery, 21,945; Ebbw Vale, 20,994; Aberdare, 43,365; Barry, 27,030; Llanelly, 25,617; Merthyr Tydvil, 69,228; Mountain Ash, 31,093; Pontypridd, 32,316; Rhondda, 113,735.

Students in the Marlborough Street Training College.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is now in a position to give the promised information with reference to the students trained in the Marlborough Street Training College.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) I have now communicated the promised Returns containing this information to the hon. Member.

Ballinasloe Lunatic Asylum—Election of Dr. Kirwan.

COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if Dr. Kirwan has been elected medical superintendent of the Ballinasloe Lunatic Asylum by a majority of the joint Galway and Roscommon Committee; and if his appointment to this position has as yet been confirmed by His Excellency the Lord-Lieutenant.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The reply to the first inquiry is in the affirmative. The appointment has not yet been confirmed by the Lord-Lieutenant.

REGISTRATION OF CLUBS (IRELAND) BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order for the Second Reading read.

MR. O'NEILL (Antrim, Mid) said that in moving the Second Reading of this Bill he was happy to say he occupied a rather pleasant position with regard to it, unusually so, because, as far as he knew at present, there was no opposition. It had been approved by the licensed victuallers of Ireland, who were particularly desirous to have this registration; it was also approved by people in favour of temperance reform, and by those who recognised that our indulgence in strong drink had been, and still was, a great distress of which Ireland was the victim. All these agreed that the promotion of temperance was very much interfered with by the establishment of clubs solely and entirely for the purpose of drinking, and not for the ordinary purposes of a club. This Bill was also approved of by the Irish Members on both sides of the House. On the back of the Bill there were eight names, four names of Irish representatives from each side. He deeply regretted that since the names were put on the Bill one of the hon. Members (Mr. McGovern) had been taken away from them. A great many measures had been passed for the furtherance of temperance in the United Kingdom. They had done, no doubt, a great deal of good, but they were very easily evaded by the establishment of these drinking clubs, which he might call bogus clubs, where drink could be sold at all hours irrespective of those which applied to public houses generally. It was to try to put a stop to these bogus clubs that this Bill was brought in; and he would like the House distinctly to understand that it was in no way aimed at legitimate and genuine clubs established for social purposes. It did not in any way interfere with the freedom or the habits of members of these clubs. The only way it affected them at all was that in future they would have to pay a fee of five shillings, and would be liable, if they did not conduct the club in the proper way, to prosecution. That was to say if sufficient information was given on oath that the club was not managed in a legal and proper manner.

The Licensing Act of 1902 was passed for England and fortunately a large portion of that Act contained powers for the registration of clubs. He was informed that it had had a very beneficial effect. If that Act had done good for England he did not see why there should not be one for Ireland. There was also a Licensing Bill passed last year for Scotland. That Bill, too, dealt with the registration of clubs. The Bill now proposed for the acceptance of the House was word for word the same as the Scotch Bill of last year, with only the necessary alterations to make it apply to Ireland. That Bill having been introduced and carried by the Government, he hoped the Government would help them to carry this Bill to-day. He would merely mention the main provisions of the Bill, without entering into details. In the first place the Bill provided that a registrar should be appointed, who was to be a petty sessions clerk. He was to keep a register of all licensed clubs in his district. When a club desired to get a certificate the secretary or the chairman would have to apply to the registrar, send him a copy of the rules of the club, a list of the names of the members, and also the certificate referred to in the first schedule of the Bill. That schedule contained the terms and form of the certificate which was to accompany the application by a club for registration or renewal, and it would have to be signed by two magistrates, certifying to the best of their knowledge and belief that the club was to be conducted as a *bona fide* club, and not merely for the supply of exciseable liquor. The registrar had also to give notice of the application for registration in some daily paper circulating in the district; and after that, if no objection was taken in the form provided for in the Bill, the Court should grant a certificate. If objections were taken the Court would then investigate them and grant a certificate or not, as they might think fit. If at the end of twelve months a renewal of the certificate was desired similar forms would have to be gone through. Clause 4 of the Bill provided that the rules of the club qualifying for registration should be strictly laid down, so as to ensure that the club was a genuine and legitimate club, and not merely a bogus club. In the first place the club must be managed by a committee, and no members of that committee, or any servant, should have any kind of personal interest in the sale of intoxicating drink in the club. The names of persons nominated for membership must be posted in a conspicuous place on the club premises for at least a week before their election. The rules would further provide that no visitor would be supplied with any drink except on the invitation of one of the members, and that no drink should be supplied outside the club in any case whatever Clause 5 stated the objections which might be urged against the granting or the renewal of a certificate. The first objection that might be taken was that the application was not in conformity with the provisions of the Act. Another was that the club was not conducted in good faith as a club. A further one was that where there was frequent drunkenness on the club's premises, or if the club was conducted in a disorderly manner, the certificate should not be granted or renewed. There were other grounds of objection which he need not enumerate. If these objections could be supported by proof a certificate would not be granted or renewed. Clause 6 dealt with the inspection of a club. It provided that if information was given by anyone and laid before a justice of the peace of any county, or divisional magistrate of Dublin metropolitan district, that the club was not being conducted in conformity with the law he might grant a search warrant to the police. The rest of the Bill merely laid down the penalties that might be inflicted for breaches of the law. He sincerely hoped the House would in the interests of temperance agree to the Second Reading of the Bill which he now begged to move.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.) said he did not rise in any spirit of hostility to the Bill or to oppose the passing of the Second Reading. The Government were most anxious that its main provisions should be extended to Ireland for the purpose of securing that *bonâ fide* workmen's clubs should be registered, and that bogus clubs should be suppressed, and that thereby the cause of temperance might be promoted and drunkenness checked. But he thought it was only fair that he should point out to his hon. friend who moved the Second Reading of the Bill some defects in its machinery rather than wait until it was discussed in Committee of the House or in Grand Committee. This Bill was a mere reproduction of certain clauses of the Scotch Bill of last year. The framers of this Bill had two precedents before them, the English Act of 1902, and the Scotch Act of 1903. The procedure under the English system was extremely simple. A club was required to register, and if any persons opened or conducted an unregistered club, or sold liquor in an unregistered club, they were liable to a penalty to be recovered before a Court of summary jurisdiction, with, of course, the accessory appeal to a Court of quarter sessions, which a conviction before a Court of summary jurisdiction always gave. His hon. friend had not followed that precedent, and possibly he was right. He had followed the Scotch system, which was entirely different. But in Scotland there was a law officer who did not exist in Ireland, namely, the sheriff-deputy—an officer of the greatest possible importance. The result was that his hon. friend, as he would see, proposed to give in Ireland to a Court of summary jurisdiction the powers which the Scotch Act gave to the sheriff, and which were inapplicable and not suited to a Court of summary jurisdiction in Ireland. He thought his hon. friend would see that this Bill in some respects would be rather ridiculous if that analogy were carried out. Under the Scotch system an appliation must be made by the secretary, and must be signed by a justice of the peace or two county magistrates, who certified in a manner to which he would call attention presently. The application came before a sheriff, who inquired into its merits, and if he approved of the application he ordered the club to be registered. The sheriff was a most important functionary in Scotland. He had all sorts of jurisdictions conferred upon him. He had jurisdiction similar to that of a commissioner in bankruptcy, a County Court Judge, a recorder, a revising barrister, and other judicial officers. He returned writs for elections, he precognosced witnesses, and had other important duties.

If his hon. friend followed him he would see that it would lead to certain confusion in Ireland to give to a Court of summary jurisdiction the powers exercised by a sheriff in Scotland. Let them assume that they started in Dublin to endeavour to carry out this system. The secretary or chairman of a club must come with a certificate, and the certificate must be signed by a divisional magistrate of the Dublin metropolitan district. The application must set out, in accordance with Clause 2, Sub-section 1, the aims and object of the club, and the address of the premises occupied by the club. The magistrate's certificate, as provided for in the first schedule of the Bill, stated that the club was to be conducted as a *bonâ fide* club. In Dublin, therefore, the certificate would be given by the Judge before whom the application came. In the county districts the certificate accompanying the application would have to be signed by two magistrates of the Court before whom the application came. In Scotland the certificate was signed by two ordinary justices, and the application came before another functionary altogether. In the case of an application in Dublin, the divisional magistrate would have to make a preliminary inquiry, and therefore he was hardly suited for the office of reviewing the application when it came before him. It was rather absurd that a certificate should come from the magistrate himself to himself. In reference to the requirement that the application should be published in a paper circulated in the district, he thought probably that in some parts of Ireland it would be impossible. There was another objection in reference to expenses. In the Scotch system which it was proposed to copy, the sheriff was entitled to hear objections from the police authorities and also from the town council of the borough, or from the parish, as the case might be. In Ireland, following the analogy of the Licensing Act, objections might be entertained either from the police or from any parishioner, he had no objection to that. In Scotland there was power to award expenses to the applicant in the case of an unsuccessful objection. That power was struck out of this Bill. He could not see why, if an objection was made against a *bonâ fide* club, and put that club to a great deal of expense, and was unsuccessful, the club should not be repaid its expenses. There was another provision which required a little consideration. In the Scotch Act it was lawful to sell liquor upon the premises to a member for consumption by himself outside the premises. Under the present Bill a working man, if he so desired, might, under Section 8, get in his club a pint of beer or stout to drink at home. But in the Scotch Act under Section 84 no excisable liquor could be sold for consumption outside the premises of the club except to a member on the premises and for his own consumption, or to a person holding an Excise licence for the sale of such liquor; and every person so doing would be liable to a penalty on summary conviction. Probably his hon. friend was right in omitting any provision permitting the sale of liquor to a person holding an Excise licence; but he thought he should consider whether a *bonâ fide* working man could not buy liquor at his club for his family.

But the real and serious objection he thought was this. Section 88 of the Scotch Act provided that the decision of the sheriff in dealing with an application for an original certificate, or for the renewal of a certificate, or the cancelling of a certificate, should be final and not subject to review. That, he thought, was a really serious objection which went very much to the foundation of the Bill, and he thought his hon. friend should consider whether he should not either change the tribunal from a Court of summary jurisdiction or give an appeal to the justices in quarter sessions. Now, the Court of summary jurisdiction in Dublin was the first police magistrate; in other parts of Ireland it was the Court of petty sessions. As he had said the appeal was from either of these at present. When they looked back and saw what the sheriff could do, and the consequences which could follow from some of his decisions, he did not think it could be said that the Court of petty sessions or the police magistrate in Dublin should be the final Court, and that there should be no appeal from their decisions. In Section 84 of the Scotch Act provision was made that if liquor was sold to those not authorised to obtain it, every person who paid for such liquor, and every person authorising the sale or supply of such liquor, should be liable to a penalty and be dealt with in a summary manner in the ordinary way. Section 85 of the Scotch Act provided that, if a complaint were made that a club was not properly conducted, the sheriff or magistrate in the burgh might pronounce an order and, on the grounds specified therein, the certificate of registration of the club would be cancelled. Then the decision of the summary Court was by the next section to be reported to the sheriff, who was to make further inquiry, and after such inquiry, having regard to the nature of the offence, he might cancel the certificate. The 86th Section provided that where the finding pronounced by the sheriff was that the club was not entitled to a renewal of its certificate on the ground that the club was not conducted in good faith as a club, or that there was frequent drunkenness on the club premises, or that persons in a state of intoxication were frequently seen to leave the club premises—the result of that provision was that every official of that club, unless he satisfied the Court that the club was so managed or carried on without his knowledge or against his consent, would be liable to a penalty not exceeding for a first offence, £7; for a second offence, whether in connection with the same or another club, £15; and for a third, or subsequent offence, £30. It was quite evident that they could not go behind the decision of the sheriff on these questions, and that all the officials in the club would become liable in those penalties. Therefore, it was most desirable that the tribunal which pronounced conclusively as to the proper mode in which a club should be carried on should be a tribunal other than the petty sessions Court.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): What do you suggest?

Mr. ATKINSON said he would suggest either of two alternatives. If the petty sessions Court was to be retained as the authority to grant the certificate, then there must be an appeal to the Court of quarter sessions; if, on the contrary, the strict analogy of the Scotch Act was to be followed, the natural thing would be to make the County Court Judge the arbiter or substitute for the sheriff in Scotland to whom application should be made. Some change of that kind was absolutely necessary; as would be seen by a reference to the second Section of Clause 9, which provided that where a report was made on conviction, that report was to be made to the sheriff. That became ridiculous when the order was made to the same Court that originally made it. He did not want, by any means, to force his hon. friend to say which alternative he should select. He had no opposition whatever to offer to the Second Reading of the Bill. On the contrary, the Government were most anxious, by every means, to help the hon. Gentleman; and it was for that reason that he had called his hon. friend's attention, and the attention of the House, to those points now, rather than bring them forward in Committee upstairs for the first time.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND said the Bill was, as far as he knew, one which everybody was anxious to have carried. It was a Bill which had been arrived at by compromise between various authorities in Ireland. It was supported by the temperance party on the one side and by the liquor trade on the other; and this being so, it would be in very great danger if the Government had any serious changes to propose in Committee. He considered it a pity these objections were not thrashed out before. He understood that a draft of the Bill was sent to the Government a considerable time ago, and not one objection was taken. It was improper that where a matter of contention had become a subject of negotiation, and when happily all parties had come to an agreement, then, at the last moment, the Government should suggest objections which had never been suggested before and which might possibly have been the subject of further negotiation and compromise; but which might now possibly prevent the Bill passing at all. What was the meaning of the Government—having the draft of the Bill in their possession and knowing both parties were trying to come to a compromise—remaining silent until a compromise was arrived at, and then stepping in to make mischief, cause dissension, and endanger the whole project. It was a most improper course, but it was quite on a par with the stupidity which governed all affairs in connection with Ireland. This inherent stupidity was not confined to this one Government; it belonged to every one. A little spirit of common sense would have avoided any danger whatever of the Bill being wrecked with these objections. With regard to the objections raised as to jurisdiction, he should object very much to making the County Court Judge the authority, though he should not object to appeal, to the County Court Judge he supposed, from petty sessions. He should reserve his final opinion until he saw what changes took place in Committee. In Committee, the sole blame would rest not upon hon. Members on either side, but upon the bungling and stupidity of the Irish Government interfering in a matter of this kind at the wrong time.

Mr. WILLIAM MOORE (Antrim, N.) said he did not intend to raise any objection such as would come within the category mentioned by the hon. Member for Waterford; because his colleague who moved the Second Reading expressly stated that the Bill was not intended in any way to interfere with the ordinary social privileges of clubs as distinguished from the mischief which they all objected to. The real mischief against which the Bill was aimed was shebeening, which should be put down with the strongest possible hand. He concurred that it would be inadvisable to put workmen's clubs under a ban to which higher class clubs were not subjected. There should be one law for all. In no part of the Bill, however, was a club defined, and the Bill as it stood might apply to a Bar mess, or to a philanthropic or scientific society which only met at stated intervals. He thought it would be undesirable to put such associations to the expense of registration, and the licensing authority should be empowered to exempt them. Moreover it might be impossible for them to alter their rules in accordance with the requirements of the Bill. He would suggest that such associations should be exempted by the Act itself or that the licensing authority should have power to exempt them. In Committee he would certainly direct attention to that point. He did not wish to make any objection to the Bill as a whole, and he was delighted that it had fallen to the lot of his hon. friend to introduce a Bill to assimilate the law in Ireland to that in Scotland.

MR. FLYNN (Cork County, N.) said it was a matter for congratulation that they were engaged in discussing a Motion on which they were all generally agreed. It was, however, a pity that the general agreement of the Irish representatives should have been marred by the injudicious speech of the Attorney-General. Certainly it would have been expected that before the Second Reading stage was arrived at the right hon. Gentleman and his colleagues would have stated their objections. As regarded the general character of the Bill, he thought that the evils of bogus clubs were exaggerated, that the number of such clubs was overstated, and that the evils they occasioned were not of such a gigantic character as had been stated. He agreed that a club which existed mainly or entirely for the consumption of drink should be suppressed; but in doing that care should be taken not to interfere with properly conducted clubs. There were very stringent provisions in the Bill with reference to club officials. A club might be carried on, as far as the officials and the committee could, in a proper manner, but there might be occasions on which undesirable events might occur without their knowledge. The penalties on officials were very severe and he thought that the Bill carried the doctrine of responsibility too far. He joined with the Irish Members generally in giving cordial support to the Bill, reserving the right, however, to move Amendments in Committee in the direction he had indicated.

COLONEL LOCKWOOD (Essex, Epping) said that England had in the past suffered a great deal from these bogus clubs; the police had been put to great trouble, and the counties had been put to great expense in order to obtain convictions and to secure the suppression of clubs which were never meant for the purposes of social enjoyment, but for the purpose of obtaining drink in prohibited hours, and thus evading the law. He did not agree with the hon. Member for Cork that they had over-estimated the danger likely to arise from clubs of this kind, and he thought the hon. Membero sn a little further investigation, would come to the conclusion that he himself had formed an erroneous opinion on that subject. He could not see what objection could be made to the proposed rules, and saw no reason why the committee and the club manager should not be responsible, and subject to a fine if the club was not properly conducted, always providing that it was within their knowledge that the club was not properly conducted. He hoped, therefore, that when this Bill got into Committee it would not be greatly interfered with, as drafted, and that the hon. Member who had been successful in introducing the measure would so carry it through the Committee that its efficiency would not in any way be impaired when it became law.

MR. THOMAS SHAW (Hawick Burghs) said he only intervened because he represented a constituency in the country from whose statute law this Bill was very largely drawn. The responsibility for the shape of this Bill, and almost for its text, rested with the Government, by reason of the fact that the text of this measure was drawn from the Scottish statute, which was a Government measure and a Government measure carried under the best auspices, because it was taken in Committee of the Whole House, which had a large representation of Scottish Members, and the Government finally accepted what was substantially the verdict of the Scottish Members. The backing of this Bill showed that all shades of political opinion in Ireland had united for the purpose of passing this Bill and although he had at first gathered from the comments of the Attorney-General that he was opposing it he was glad to note from the hon. and learned Gentleman's concluding phrases that he had drawn a wrong conclusion from the hon. and learned Gentleman's remarks. All the points which the hon. and learned Gentleman had dealt with were, however, Committee points, though no doubt the Committee would derive great help from the speech he had delivered. As to the way in which the Scottish Bill had worked, he pointed out that in the one year after its passage, they had, in Glasgow, suppressed forty-five bogus clubs, and the disclosures made in the course of the trials of those cases which were contested were deplorable. Drinking clubs were established solely for the sale of liquor, and they were in many cases started by what might be termed disfranchised licensees, who, having lost their legitimate licence to retail liquor, had taken in this matter to shebeening. Convicted betting men also apparently found the carrying on of a club of this kind a most convenient annexe to their ordinary business of book-making. It might, therefore, be fairly assumed that this was an evil which it would be desirable to get rid of, but a knowledge of the extent of that evil in Ireland would only be obtained after this Bill became law. He did not consider the penalties at all too severe. All clubs of this kind which were continued in Ireland after the passage of this Bill would be continued solely for the sordid purpose of selling drink and making money, and the only thing that would stop them being carried on would be a good whacking fine. The curse of these clubs was that they were used by poor creatures insufficiently housed who frequented them for that comfort which they could not find at home. The House had shown by the general assent it had given to the Bill that it was dealing with a much more substantial question than had been suggested by the hon. Member for North Cork. They had, in the first place, a grievance to start with, and that prompted him to say that when they had a grievance, and especially an Irish grievance, the sooner they set about getting rid of it the better. Secondly, they had the experience of a measure actually in effect at the present time. A measure which, it was admitted, had been working splendidly, and, so far as he knew, not one single case of hardship had occurred in its operation. He hoped that they would agree to the Second Reading of the Bill before the House, with a desire to send it to Committee, and to pass it through its remaining stages with as little alteration as possible. The real object of the measure was to get as near as possible to the root and foundation of one of the social curses of life in modern times, and he hoped that the example of Scotland in this matter would be wisely and completely followed by passing this Bill.

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. JAMES CAMPBELL, Dublin University) said he thought it was a matter for regret that on the introduction of the Bill, or rather, on the Motion for its Second Reading, a Motion which seemed to meet with approval in all quarters, the hon. and learned Member for the city of Waterford should have thought it necessary to indulge in one of his now somewhat continual attacks upon the Irish legal executive. He was aware that his right hon. friend the Attorney-General for Ireland had become so accustomed to these attacks that he would be almost lonely without them. They did not appear to have much effect upon him, and he could say of his own knowledge that in regard to many matters of alleged mistakes and inaccuracies—for which the hon. and learned Gentleman and other representatives of Irish constituencies sought to fix the responsibility upon the right hon. and learned Gentleman—they were mistaken, for he was no more responsible than the man in the street. Personally, he was, perhaps, a little more sensitive to these attacks, because of his lack of practice and experience of Parliament. He desired to say that, personally, the proposer of this Bill had given him no opportunity whatever of seeing it. Neither had it been laid before him or his opinion asked upon it from any quarter.

MR. O'NEILL: I submitted the Bill to the Chief Secretary, but the hon. and learned Gentleman was not in the room at the time. I have here, however, a letter from the Chief Secretary saying that he agreed to the measure.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL said that it did not get rid of the point of his observation, which was a personal one, and was to the effect that he himself had had no opportunity of seeing the Bill, and neither had his opinion been asked upon it. Now what was the head and front of the alleged offending of his right hon. and learned colleague? As he understood it, it was this, that the right hon. Gentleman had anticipated a discussion that might more properly have taken place in Committee with reference to one matter, and one matter only, a matter in which the Bill, which in other respects was a reproduction of the Scotch Act of last year, had departed from the principle of that Act.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: That is not my complaint at all. My complaint is that these negotiations were going on between the opposing parties with reference to this Bill. They arrived at an agreement, and they submitted the agreement and a copy of the Bill before they printed it, and the Goverment assented to it, either by silence or, as it now appears, by a letter from the Chief Secretary. It is only to-day for the first time that we hear an objection taken to one of the clauses in the Bill. My complaint is that that procedure is calculated to endanger the passage of the measure.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL said he did not quite follow the point, nor did he see the force of the hon. and learned Gentleman's complaint. The action of the Government that day was exactly the same as it was when the communication was received from the hon. Member who had moved the Second Reading of the Bill. The Government were entirely in favour of the principle of the Bill. They desired to see the measure read a second time, and his right hon. friend's intervention was for the express purpose of facilitating the passage of the Bill. He had simply pointed out to those who were interested in it that they should be prepared for some reform or change in Committee on the lines of restoring in their entirety the principles of the Scotch Act. There might be alternative methods suggested as to the Courts upon which the responsibility was to be thrown for carrying out the legal procedure embodied in the Bill. It was quite possible that the negotiations which had resulted in the harmonious arrangement come to might have in some way been interfered with, or delayed, or interrupted, if any other course had been taken, but it seemed to him that what had occurred was more calculated to facilitate the progress of the measure. The Government supported, as he had said, the principle of the Bill, and they considered that it was a good Bill in every shape and form. It had been moulded to a large extent upon an existing Act of Parliament, brought in with the approval of all sections of Members in the House, and which, during the short time it had been in force, had worked most satisfactorily. In only one respect did the Bill depart from the principle of the Scotch Act, and he thought it would probably have been premature and might have led ultimately to the abandonment of the measure, if the Government had, while the negotiations were going on, suggested matters which might have formed a bone of contention between the parties who were seeking to draft the Bill. Be that as it may, he could only repeat that the object of his right hon. friend was to give hon. Members who were interested in the success of the measure notice that there was one point with which they must be prepared to deal when the Bill went before a Committee.

Two alternatives had been suggested. One was that they should follow the Scotch Act in its entirety, and leave the jurisdiction to the County Court Judge as in Scotland it was left to the sheriff. There was a good deal to be said for that, more particularly if they looked at some of the sections which enabled the Court to impose a fine amounting in some cases to as high a sum as £50. He thought it would certainly be impossible to leave such a jurisdiction to Courts of petty sessions in Ireland unless the party aggrieved was granted a right of appeal to a County Court Judge. If they adopted the principle embodied in the Scotch Act by keeping the County Court Judge as the legal authority to enforce the provisions of the measure, all that would be necessary would be to introduce in Committee a clause of four lines conferring a right of appeal to the County Court Judge on the party aggrieved by any decision of the Court of summary jurisdiction. He thought that the representatives of Irish constituencies might congratulate themselves that there was a substantial agreement in this matter in all quarters of the House. The Bill was one which would undoubtedly affect the social and industrial welfare of their country. It would give facilities for the establishment and promotion of *bona fide* clubs intended for the social and intellectual culture of their members; and, on the other hand, it would place obstacles in the way of the growth and continuance of clubs, the whole or principal motive of which was the consumption of drink at irregular hours and in irregular ways. He had only risen for the purpose of vindicating his right hon. and learned colleague against the charge of having intervened for no other purpose than to hamper the progress of the Bill. As he had said, he thought that the right hon. Gentleman's intervention was more calculated to facilitate its being placed on the Statute-book of the Realm, because they would approach the Committee stage with a fuller knowledge of what was required in order to ensure the passing of the measure.

Mr. HUGH LAW (Donegal, W.) said he did not intend to follow on the points raised by the Solicitor-General for Ireland, who seemed to have entirely misapprehended the objections raised by the hon. and learned Member for Waterford, whose complaint was not that the Attorney-General had intervened too early, but that he had not raised the point on an earlier occasion. He hoped it would be possible to arrive at a satisfactory arrangement. There was every sign that that would be done, but if such an arrangement were not made it would be necessary for some of those whose names were on the Bill to reconsider their position. It might be interesting to the House to know the opinion of English working men with regard to the portion of the Licensing Act which dealt with the registration of clubs. A natural fear had been expressed lest the provisions of the measure should act to the detriment of *bona fide* working men's clubs. Upon that point he would quote from the draft report of the Club Union, which represented 1,000 working-men's clubs in England, with a membership of over 400,000—

> "On the whole, the first year of the working of the Act evokes little dissent from the statement of last year's report that the Act is one which causes no injury to well-managed clubs. . . . Fifty-five clubs have been struck off the register by the decisions of magistrates under the Act, whilst a still larger number, especially in London, closed their doors for fear of the Act's operation. Almost without exception, therefore, the object of the legislation has been achieved. Few clubs, if any, have been punished which did not deserve punishment. . . . In all, twelve union clubs have been penalised. In the face of much contradictory evidence, in three or four cases, it is fair to assume that the magistrates gave their verdict after a careful and judicial consideration of the facts. In the other cases the penalty seems to have been clearly deserved; and such clubs are entitled to no sympathy."

Such an expression of opinion on the part of a great body of working men would be a satisfaction to the House, and there was every reason to hope that a similar measure would work without injustice in Ireland, and fulfil the object for which it had been brought forward.

Mr. GORDON (Londonderry, S.) said the Bill had been promoted for the purpose of removing a great evil with which magistrates found considerable difficulty in dealing. The object was to simplify the whole business and to put clubs in such a position that it should be at once known that they were on the register, what their rules were, and what the consequences of any infringement of these rules would be. He gathered from the remarks of the Solicitor-General that the only matter that the Government proposed to deal with in Committee was the question of appeal. The magistrates appeared to be the proper tribunal to give the certificates and to deal with objections. As to penalties there would probably be little difficulty in securing the assent of the promoters to a right of appeal being granted—possibly to the County Court Judge. Section 10 had been complained of, but he failed to see what more reasonable provision could be put into an Act of Parliament. The offences defined in the section were those for which the officials would be responsible, and there could be no hardship inflicted by the penalties being imposed upon the persons responsible rather than on the club members generally. As to the question of the right of members to purchase drink at the club and carry it off the premises for consumption, he was not certain whether the Attorney-General would consider that a suitable matter for treatment in Committee. He hoped he would not. Bogus clubs did not exist to any large extent in the country districts of Ireland, but they did in the cities, and such a provision would lead to an immense amount of mischief. He heartily joined with previous speakers in asking that the Bill should be altered as little as possible in Committee, and that nothing would be done to unduly retard its progress or to prevent its becoming law this session.

MR. JORDAN (Fermanagh, S.) thought the bench of magistrates was the proper tribunal before which proceedings in relation to the registration of clubs should be initiated, and he agreed that there should be an appeal to the County Court Judge. He wholly disagreed, however, with the statement of the Attorney-General that the clubs ought to have the power to sell drink to be consumed off the premises.

MR. ATKINSON said he had not suggested that. He had merely called attention to the fact that, although the Bill purported to follow the Scotch Act, it had omitted that provision which was in force in Scotland.

MR. JORDAN expressed his satisfaction at the statement of the right hon. Gentleman. He was wholly opposed to clubs, which were for social and intellectual purposes, being turned into public-houses. If the Bill went to a Grand Committee, of which he was a member, he should do his best to secure its passage.

SIR WILLIAM TOMLINSON (Preston) said he wished to make an observation or two with reference to the position in which the House stood. There was no doubt, as was shown in evidence on an inquiry by a Select Committee of which he was a member, that the regulation of clubs was quite as much required in Ireland as in the other parts of the United Kingdom. For England and Scotland the regulation of clubs had been provided for as part of Government measures. For Ireland a Bill had been introduced by private Members, which was in principle supported with practical unanimity, but though it was principally a machinery Bill to adapt the provisions of those Acts to Ireland, it was obvious that there was some difference of opinion on details. They had arrived at a period of the session in which there were great difficulties in the way of private Members passing Bills through their later stages, and he thought that it was almost a matter of justice that the Government, having carried through Acts for the same object as the present Bill for England and Scotland, should give whatever assistance was necessary to pass this Bill into law during the present session.

*MR. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green) in supporting the measure, said he agreed with the Solicitor-General and the Attorney-General when they stated that the magistrates had had much difficulty in dealing with the bogus clubs. As one hon. Member had already said, they were often got up by publicans who had lost their licences and betting men in Scotland, and they had had the same experience in Ireland. There ought to be some provision to prevent men staying in clubs all night drinking, and that was the kind of clubs they desired to get at. He believed that this Bill was an honest attempt to reduce the drunkenness which unhappily prevailed in Ireland and in the city of Dublin in consequence of these bogus clubs, and there were far too many temptations to this kind of thing. As a working man, he welcomed this attempt to regulate clubs in Ireland. Any clubs in Ireland that were properly conducted had nothing to fear under this Act. They wanted to get at the bogus clubs and he thought this Act would have that beneficial effect. He wished to say a word with reference to the point raised by the hon. Member for Fermanagh in regard to the prohibition of the sale of intoxicating liquors off the premises. In this Bill there was a provision to provide against any such thing, and he appealed to the members of the Grand Committee, if this Bill was sent to that Committee, not to reject this provision. These clubs were intended for social and intellectual recreation. In the club he belonged to they had a cricket club, reading room, and a library, and lectures were given by some of the leading men in Dublin. They did not want clubs to provide drink for the home. It had been said that the necessity for these clubs in Ireland was greater because the housing accommodation of the people was so bad that the men had no other places to go into in order to read their newspapers and have quiet and social conversation with one another. Working men wanted a place where they could go and have a quiet read, and a smoke, and a drink if they wanted it. He agreed, however, that clubs should be compelled to close at a reasonable hour, so as to enable a man to go home and take his necessary rest. He would also support a provision being inserted in regard to these clubs supplying refreshments of a temperance nature. Working men had as much right to the privilege of a club as people in a higher sphere of life. He would only ask that no harassing conditions should be applied to *bona fide* clubs. If that request were complied with they would have no reason to fear the operation of the Bill.

MR. MOONEY (Dublin County, S.) expressed the hope that the Attorney-General would reconsider his decision in regard to Clause 8, to which he seemed to be rather averse. That clause specified the penalties for supplying exciseable liquor for consumption outside of a registered club. If the right hon. Gentleman inquired into the matter he would find that a great defect of the Scotch Act was that it had not a clause of that kind. Anybody who knew the big cities of England and Scotland could tell hon. Members that if people carried liquor away from a house and consumed it afterwards they got into a worse condition than they would otherwise do. It was not often that Irish representives on both sides of the House were agreed, but to-day they had the pleasure of finding themselves in accord in regard to this measure, and even the hon. Baronet, the Member for Preston was anxious that the Government should give every possible facility for the passing of the Bill. Some years ago Dublin suffered very much indeed from bogus clubs, but owing to the stringent action which had been taken they had diminished very greatly. He had several objections to the Bill which could be dealt with in Committee. In regard to the penalties, he would be in favour of making them even heavier, believing that any man on whom they should be inflicted would deserve all the punishment he got.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.) said he was very pleased to find himself in accord with all that had been said by hon. Members opposite, and on his side, with regard to this Bill. He endorsed every word that the hon. and learned Member for Waterford had said. It was a most unfortunate thing that an arrangement could not be arrived at between the Government and the promoters of the Bill such as had been arrived at between hon. Members, and that there should be a bone of contention. He did not take anything which was said by hon. Members opposite as an attack upon the Attorney-General. All that had been said he took as a matter of policy to show that the promoters of the Bill were anxious to get the co-operation of the Government. The promoters wished that the Government should point out anything they considered wrong with the Bill so that when it came into the House it might be got through without any serious difficulty. The compromise arrived at between those who were not strictly temperance advocates and those who were temperance advocates was a very agreeable one. Last year he had the honour of introducing a Bill, which passed its Second Reading stage, for the early Saturday closing of public houses in Ireland. Hon. Members opposite then made a promise that if an effort were made to deal with the question of clubs it would have their entire support, and they had been true to their promise. He agreed that it would be a disastrous thing for members of clubs to be permitted to take drink outside. Permission to do that would not have his support nor should it have the support of those who desired that working men should have the same liberty as men of better social position. The Solicitor-General for Ireland had said that he had not seen the Bill before it was introduced, but the hon. Member who moved the Second Reading produced an acknowledgment of the receipt of the Bill from the Chief Secretary. It was not, therefore, for the Solicitor-General to say that he did not see it. If the Chief Secretary did not perform his duty in submitting it to his colleagues it was his hon. friend's fault, and not that of Irish Members. He thought the Irish Members had a grievance in this matter. It was, however, a matter of great satisfaction that Irish Members on both sides should find themselves in the unique position of agreeing with regard to the expediency of passing this Bill.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed to the Standing Committee on Trade, Etc.

AGED PENSIONERS BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order for Second Reading read.

*MR. GOULDING (Wiltshire, Devizes) said that in moving the Second Reading of the Aged Pensioners Bill in the unavoidable absence of his hon. friend the Member for Holborn, he might remind the House that a similar Bill had in 1902, and again in 1903, received a Second Reading without a division. Last year he and those who supported the measure were successful in getting it referred to a Select Committee. The Report of that Committee had been presented, and he had amended this Bill, as far as he had been able, on the lines of the Committee's recommendations. In other respects the Bill remained unaltered. A person who had maintained himself as a good citizen during what might be called the working years of his life, on reaching the age of sixty-five, if in need, as defined in the Bill, would be entitled to a pension, not merely as a charity, but as a right, of not less than 5s. or more than 7s. per week, subject to certain disqualifications as to receipt of Poor Law relief and imprisonment. The receipt of this pension would not be treated as a badge of failure or inferiority, and so would not disqualify the recipient from exercising the franchise and participating in the privileges of a free citizen. The qualifications for a pension were good citizenship, as defined in the Bill. No special form of thrift was singled out for reward. A large proportion of the wage earning community were totally unable to provide by financial contributions for old age. They found it as much as they could do to meet their daily wants, and to provide for sickness and burial expenses. The officials who were to administer the Act, were the Poor Law officials—a most deserving body of men—so that a new army of State employees would not be created, but the money granted for pensions for the aged poor would, in fact, be spent upon them. The Bill retained the clauses which made it necessary for a would-be pensioner to prove his title to a pension. As a man who sought a situation produced testimonials of good character so also in regard to pensions. As this was not a Bill for universal pensions, it would be absolutely necessary, if they were to distinguish between the deserving and the thriftless poor, that the applicant for a pension must be prepared to prove his right to it. It was said last session in the debate on the Bill that if a man was to prove his title that would necessitate inquisitorial proceedings into the past of the individual which would prove extremely hard on the applicant; but in those colonies and States where old-age pensions were in force they were given after public inquiry, and no complaints were heard as to any indignity or hardship. One of the chief witnesses before the Select Committee, the Agent-General for New Zealand, stated that no case had occurred in that colony in which any individual applicant had stated as a grievance that he had had to prove his title. Those seeking pensions were proud of their credentials, and in New Zealand and Victoria the inquiry was made in open Court, and in Denmark it was looked on as a friendly chat. As this was a Bill to distinguish between the deserving and the non-deserving poor, and not a Bill for universal pensions, it was absolutely necessary that some inquiry should be made into the past of the applicants.

Administration and control would be centred in the localities where the people were most likely to be acquainted with the applicants and able to bring proper safeguards against imposition and fraud. It was pointed out before the Committee that as it was proposed that the Treasury should contribute one half of the cost they should be empowered to nominate one-half of the pensions committee, in the same way that Income-tax Commissioners were appointed at the present time, and gave their services for no remuneration. The alternative would be, as was done abroad, the appointment of a stipendary magistrate or special Commissioner; but the appointment of these *ad hoc* Commissioners would entail considerable expense and the consequent diverting of the money granted for pensions. The remainder of the pensions committee would be appointed by the Poor Law guardians of the district, who would be required to select two-thirds from their own body, and co-opt the other third from persons in the locality who were specially qualified, as members of friendly societies and thrift organisations, to discharge the duty. There was a recommendation in the Report of the Select Committee that in dealing with the question of old-age pensions, it was most desirable to go step by step. That Resolution was carried in the Committee by the casting vote of the Chairman. He maintained that the present proposals were a minimum. If they were to have a satisfactory old-age pension system as a matter of right, the applicant, when he had proved his case, should be able to claim his pension at once. If they were to allow applicants to qualify and then to limit the number of pensioners in a locality, it would bring in the hateful system of selection, and open the flood-gates of private influence and favouritism. The Bill was based on the broad and bold lines that, once a man or woman proved the necessary qualification, he or she was, *ipso facto*, entitled to a pension. Another recommendation of the Select Committee, that regarding aliens, he had adopted to the best of his ability. He had also put in a clause safeguarding rich children from divesting themselves of responsibility for their parents. Power was given in the Bill to recover from the children such sums as the pensions committee had expended in pensions on the parents.

He did not think it was necessary for him to argue here and now as to whether in principle a pension for deserving poor was desirable or not. He ventured to think that when this Parliament had, on two occasions, passed the Second Reading of an Old-Age Pensions Bill without a division, they had declared that such a measure was necessary. The members of the Government by accepting the Second Reading, bound themselves down to the principle of old-age pensions; and those who had followed recent by-elections must have noticed that every candidate had pledged themselves to support it. The principle had been accepted long ago, and they had now to find some means whereby the principle could be carried out in practice. No one would deny that our present Poor Law system provided for the destitute poor, and was not intended to help the deserving poor, but those who had exercised thrift should receive some recognition in old age to enable them to retain their position of independence and self respect. He was convinced that a small and certain endowment in old age would do much to keep alive hope, be a great inducement to thrift, and encourage the poor to put by when possible, while it would remove the terror that haunted the declining years of many of our industrial poor. It would also relieve the great friendly societies of the incubus which now hung over them, and caused them often, under the guise of sick pay, to give old-age pay to their members, as the friendly societies had not the heart to strike them off and drive their old members on to the Poor Law. He did not think the House was aware with what ease the State granted old-age pensions to its own officials. Every session there was a Bill to grant superannuation allowances and pensions to civil servants, police, municipal officers, soldiers, and sailors. In the year ending 31st March last, the amount spent on superannuation allowances to civil servants was £2,613,471, on naval pensions £1,970,000, and on military pensions £3,306,000. On these three services alone the expenditure last year was £7,889,000, so that the State had already implicated itself in the question of pensions to a very large amount.

He knew that on this question hon. Members were desirous that some solution could be found which would be economic, but these hon. Members when they pledged themselves to old-age pensions must have been convinced that these would cost money. He believed that the country could and should afford the necessary expense of old-age pensions. The taxable capacity of the country had increased three-fold during the last fifty years, while the amount spent on Poor Law had only increased 50 per cent., despite more humane and expensive administration of the Poor Law system. The question of cost was considered by Sir Edward Hamilton's Committee, but that Report did not give very much guidance as to the possible expense. That Committee had taken no account of the funds in the hands of the Charity Commissioners, amounting to no less than £1,000,000 a year, at present spent on old-age pensions; nor had they taken into consideration the pensions paid to the military and naval services, and by the friendly societies. Nor was any account taken of what a saving would be made if aged couples were to be able to live together. There were cases where they could get some guidance, if not absolute light, as to what the cost of an old-age pension system would be. There were three countries—Denmark, New Zealand, and Victoria—in which old-age pensions were in force and from which could be deduced an estimate as to the probable number of pensioners and the possible cost. In Denmark, in 1900, with a population of 2,600,000, there were, roughly speaking, 42,000 pensioners, and the cost was £285,000 a year. Applying the same principle, although the amount of the pensions in Denmark was considerably less than proposed in the Bill for England and Wales, but doubling the cost as the amount of the individual pension would be considerably greater, the expense would be £8,000,000, allowing for no saving on the existing cost of the Poor Law, as the new administration would deal with the aged deserving poor. In New Zealand a man whose income was below £52 a year was eligible for a pension. The number in receipt of old-age pensions was 1,200, or one in seventy of the population. In Victoria, where an old-age pension scheme was also in operation, 16,000 were in receipt of pensions, or about one in seventy-five of the population. From these figures he calculated that in this country about 500,000 of people, excluding State pensioners—soldiers, sailors, and civil servants—and also municipal employees, would be in receipt of old-age pensions under the Bill; and that the cost at £14 per pensioner would amount to £7,000,000 for England, Ireland and Wales. In none of these calculations the consequent saving in the administration of the Poor Law was credited. Therefore the cost of the scheme to the State would be something like £4,000,000, or, bringing in Scotland, £4,500,000 sterling. He maintained that they had in Denmark, New Zealand, and Victoria, data which did not lead them to expect the appalling figures set forth by Sir Edward Hamilton, but much more reasonable figures.

Hon. Members who had interested themselves in the question of old-age pensions had done their best to keep it alive in this House; but their powers as private Members were exhausted; and if anything were to be done it would have to be done by the responsible Government of the day. They had put aside Party politics altogether. On the back of the Bill were the names of Radicals, Nationalists, Liberal Unionists, and Conservatives. This great question could only be solved by both Parties determining to blot out Party politics, and let the State as a State, and the people as a nation, come forward and endeavour to grapple with it. The Government of the day was now responsible. Ministers might bless an old-age pension Bill; but if they believed in the question it was their duty to endeavour to solve it. Knowing as he did how keen an interest his right hon. friend the President of the Local Government Board took in the question of Poor Law reform, and the extraordinary advance which had been made in the direction of reform during the period of office of his right hon. friend, he begged of him to bring in some measure to solve the problem of old-age pensions, and not let it be said by the people that the House of Commons did not represent the workers of the country, that it was out of touch with what really affected the wants of the poorest section of the community, and that until there was a larger Labour representation in the House the question of old-age pensions would not be solved. He appealed to the Government to accept responsibility in the matter and to take it up.

*Mr. JOHN HUTTON (Yorkshire, Richmond) said he desired to second the Motion. He would appeal to the House whether the Poor Law at the present time was not ripe for amendment. It was notorious that the name of the workhouse to people in the country was one of fear and dread. He thought there was some reason for that. It was different in workhouses in the great towns, which were administered with very great care, and in which it was possible to make provision for classification which removed many of the grievances under which the aged poor suffered in the smaller workhouses. The President of the Local Government Board and his predecessor had done a very great deal with regard to the amelioration of the condition of the aged poor in the large workhouses; but it was impossible under existing circumstances to continue the same classification of the aged poor in the small workhouses in country districts. Many only contained thirty, forty, or fifty occupants, so that it was impossible to separate those who were deserving from the undeserving. In the small rural workhouses the state of things was sometimes so horrible that he did not wonder that the poor dreaded having to go to them in their old age. They dreaded country workhouses, especially in the North of England. In most of the country workhouses, imbeciles and persons of unsound mind, who were oftentimes extremely mischievous, were allowed to roam about the wards. He had known workhouses in which the imbeciles had been so troublesome that they had pulled the clothes off the old people's beds at night. They interfered with the other inmates, and also suffered themselves, because of the way they were treated. He had known cases of such bad characters in workhouses that he did not wonder that the respectable poor hesitated to enter them. He saw a woman in a workhouse who was more or less an imbecile. She had a daughter in the same workhouse who was also an imbecile, and a grandchild. That woman went out year after year, and invariably returned for the purpose of using the workhouse as a lying-in hospital. Surely, to have to meet such a class of people was a horror to the respectable poor. He had known an old woman of ninety who was left in the workhouse infirmary without anyone to tend or take care of her. He had known another woman of such disgusting habits that she was unfitted for the company of the other inmates. He had known a workhouse in which two murderers associated with the other inmates. He had known a workhouse with a drunken master, who made the house a perfect Hades to the inmates. With such records as these, which were well known to the local poor, was it to be wondered that the poor dreaded the very thought of having to end their days within such buildings? There was also the question of discipline. Men and women who had been free to come and go all their lives did not care to submit to having to go to bed and get up at certain hours and to be summoned to their meals by the sound of a bell, after having been so long accustomed to the freedom of their own homes.

He hoped the House would understand he was not exaggerating the state of affairs. Several Committees had sat to consider the state of the Poor Law, and the Cottage Homes Bill Committee of 1899 reported in favour of the classification of inmates, the provision of suitable accommodation in separate buildings for the proper treatment of all pauper imbeciles and epileptics, and the provision of cottage homes. The Committee of last year also favoured an extension of the cottage home system. He cared not, however, how the amelioration of the condition of the poor was carried out, it remained true that they had a great grievance, and he joined in the earnest appeal to the President of the Local Government Board to take steps before the end of the present Parliament to bring in a measure to alleviate their condition. The Report of the Parliamentary Committee which sat in 1899 showed that the condition of most of the rural workhouses was a disgrace to the country. He had long felt that in this matter the aged and deserving poor had a cruel grievance. It was often impossible for them to make any provision for their old age; and when they reached that age they were compelled to enter workhouses and associate with the failures of society. Surely it was the duty of the State to endeavour to alleviate the sad condition of the unfortunate poor in their old age. The case of men and women who endeavoured to provide for their aged parents until late in life should be appreciated by hon. Members, and such persons should not be consigned to the misery of the workhouse in their old age. This was not a Party question. It was one which every hon. Member would, he was certain, support, and if his right hon. friend the President of the Local Government Board wished to descend to posterity with a great name he could secure it by making proper and adequate provision for the aged deserving poor.

Mr. BRIGG (Yorkshire, W. R., Keighley) said that on the Opposition side of the House there existed a disposition equally strong in favour of those in distressed circumstances as that which had been displayed by Ministerialists. He doubted whether there was a single Member present who had not at some time framed a pension scheme, and those who had had generally come to the ground on the subject of the difficulty of finding the money. That was the difficulty. In Germany it was met by a system under which every man subscribed a small sum annually to an insurance fund, which was administered by the State. Regarding the responsibility of the boards of guardians for finding a share of the money, he was very much afraid, from what he knew of boards of guardians, that they would not find new money for that purpose, but would contrive that the money which would otherwise have been paid very likely to the same people would now be paid to the pensioners. Again, in any attempt to deal with the matter, the position which the friendly societies held in reference to the better class of working people must be taken into account. The clause empowering the guardians to strike out from the applicants' list the names of the improvident was a sweeping provision, which would relieve the guardians from any danger of abuse. He welcomed the Bill and hoped that the Government would at some future time devise a scheme to encourage providence and provide for the poor in their old age.

Mr. CRIPPS (Lancashire, Stretford) said he agreed that the principle of this Bill had been accepted by the House on former occasions, but, after all, it had only been accepted in the same academic spirit that many other principles were on the occasion of similar discussions, on which occasions, although the principle was accepted, the House did not identify itself with the proposals of any particular scheme. He did not wish to go into what had been called the general question, because his opinions were identical with those expressed by the late Mr. Lecky, who, in the Minority Report of the Committee of 1899, of which both were members, set out the difficulties of an old-age pension scheme. The real question was, what was the attitude the Government were going to take? Did they intend to make a workable scheme out of the Bill, or was their attitude simply one of benevolent sympathy, which meant nothing at all in a scheme of this kind and was much to be deprecated? In discussing a question of this kind, they had to thrash out if they could what was best for all classes—the poorer classes if they pleased—and when a proposal was brought forward those who criticised it were not to be stigmatised as the opponents to the true reformers. He himself in Lancashire was asked this very question, and he refused to identify himself with any old-age pension scheme which had been brought forward. The hon. Member for Devizes went too far in assuming that this matter had been thrashed out in the electorate in a concrete form. The competitive form of old-age pensions, relying on an extension of the Poor Law system, bristled with difficulties. Whatever improvements might be necessary in the Poor Law, they must entirely differentiate that side of the problem. In old-age pensions there were two matters to be considered from different standpoints. If it was maintained that a pension was a thing to which a man was entitled by right, it ought to be given to him by mere machinery, and there ought not to be any inquisitorial examination as to whether he was entitled to the privilege which Parliament had given him. He ventured to lay down two propositions. There must be no local authority equivalent to the Poor Law authority to consider the qualifications of the applicant. Conditions must be laid down by the State, and just as anyone entitled to a pension could get it by filling up a form before a magistrate or some other responsible person, without any inquisitorial examination, so must it be in the case of old-age pensions.

The Bill before the House was founded on another basis. This Bill was a kind of Poor Law measure competing with the existing Poor Law administration. There was to be the same system of local inquisitorial committees, who were to take into consideration not only administrative principles and tests, but whether the person who applied was on moral grounds entitled to a pension or not, and when its proposer said it was an advantage in this matter not to go step by step because of a fear that there would be selection, he had overlooked the fact that he had left the same bad principle in his Bill. He always had objected and always should object to a Bill of this kind being based on Poor Law principles, instead of on the true principles of pensions, if they were to have pensions at all. What did the proposer mean when he said that our soldiers and sailors and our civil servants had pensions to the extent of £8,000,000 a year? It must be remembered that those pensions were largely in the nature of deferred pay. They had already earned that money, but it was withheld and given in the form of a pension in order that the old servants of the State should not find their way into the workhouse. That was a fair thing. But because a pensioner was receiving something in the nature of deferred pay which was not sufficient to maintain him was he not entitled like anybody else to an old-age pension under this Bill. The difficulty arising from this Bill was the not keeping from it the inquisitorial Poor Law system and the not admitting, if it was admitted at all, that a pension was a question of right. When they came to the question of a man being entitled as a right to an old-age pension, then it would be necessary to lay down the principle under which he was so entitled.

As to the question of expense, if the principles advocated by some hon. Gentlemen were to prevail the charges on local rates would be twice as heavy as they were. The fatal blot on this scheme was the charging of these so-called pensions upon local funds. He absolutely protested against that. There was no claim for putting a charge of this kind on the ratepayers, and if the charge was to be undertaken at all that House must take the responsibility of putting it on the Imperial Exchequer and providing the necessary Imperial funds. He would like to know what the proposals of the Chancellor of the Exchequer would be regarding the raising of the £8,000,000 which would be required. The reason why he said any Bill was unsound which proposed to charge the local rates was that as regards local taxation about two-thirds of the taxable property escaped taxation altogether. Whereas 1d. on the income-tax produced about £2,500,000, 1d. for local taxation produced rather less than £800,000. Assuming for the purposes of argument that for the social good of the poorer classes of this country it was decided that we ought to have an old-age pension scheme, where were the funds to come from? It was not a local matter it was an Imperial matter. To place the charge on the rates would involve an addition of 7d. in the £ in many of the poorest districts in the country. Why should the people who mainly employed working men, the rich employers of labour, escape their fair share of the heavy burden which old-age pensions involved? He did not believe that the President of the Local Government Board, whom this matter would largely concern, could justify any such proposal as throwing the cost of old-age pensions on the rates. The persons primarily responsible for old-age pensions were the employers, and the problem ought to be approached from that point of view, and the funds provided from the employers and employed in certain proportions, and the rest ought to come from the State. They must, however, wait till the matter was taken up by the Government, and no private Member ought to have the right to propose this form of taxation until the Government told them what the charge would be and on what back it was to be borne.

*Mr. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.) said he congratulated the hon. and learned Gentleman upon having made a real contribution to the debate. He had demonstrated in a most lucid manner how faulty a method it was to attempt to carry out on Poor Law lines an object which was not a Poor Law object. He himself had again and again expressed his warm sympathy with the hon. Member for Wiltshire and his friends in their desire to press forward their proposals for providing old-age pensions, but he had also, over and over again, in his own way, urged the same objections to those proposals which had been so forcibly urged by his hon. and learned friend. It was entirely impossible to apply effectively the tests in the Bill, and to work a really fair system of discrimination without a greatly increased cost, which would really be a waste of the money, which had better go directly to alleviating the condition of the aged poor. His hon. and learned friend had done right to appeal to the House not to treat this matter as mere palaver, but that they should face the realities of this problem and recognise that it could not be dealt with otherwise than by a responsible Government dealing boldly and unreservedly with the whole question in all its aspects. It was entirely a matter of cost, and they had to face a tremendous outlay in dealing with this question if it was to be dealt with on the broad and generous lines which alone would be practical. One objection he had to this Bill was that it dealt with such a limited number of the cases which needed relief, and which really commanded sympathy, and there was no escape from that without having to face an enormous expense. He gave every credit to those who had put forward these proposals. He himself had a still more ambitious proposal on the Table of the House at the present time, and he was relieved of his embarrassment by the knowledge that the proposal could not come before the House, because it seemed to him that the position in which they were placed in this matter was so absurdly academic as to almost border on unreality. He did not wish to raise controversial topics, nor to deal with the question from a Party point of view, but the present position was plain. They had a Government which was not in a position to assist them; a Government which had even in this second year of peace largely increased the national expenditure, and instead of lightening their burdens had imposed new taxation, both direct and indirect, and could any hon. Member under those circumstances and in the face of our present expenditure and taxation seriously come before the House and hope to carry a scheme involving £4,500,000, £12,000,000, £20,000,000, or more likely, if a real scheme covering the whole ground were attempted, £26,000,000? It was hopeless to suppose this question could be approached satisfactorily until a Government was in power which was prepared to face the financial responsibility of this great social reform which was only to be defended by showing that it was vitally essential as a social reform for the benefit of the whole nation. At the present time it would be impossible to place any greater burden on the local rates. And, as for taxes, it was almost impossible to increase them in their present form. Any Government attempting to deal with this question seriously must be prepared to make sweeping reductions in our expenditure on the Army and Navy and be prepared to find new sources of taxation, such as the taxation of land values in towns, mining royalties, and to largely increase the death duties and the other taxes which fall on accumulated wealth. He did not know whether any supporters of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham were there and would suggest further indirect taxation, but to attempt to meet the expense of this great proposal from indirect taxation, however obtained, would be very cruel and entirely wrong to the working classes of this country.

Sir CARNE RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford) protested, as an agricultural Member, against the scheme. It would be worse for the agricultural interest than even the Education Act, and that was saying a good deal. Agriculturists simply could not afford to have any extra taxation brought on agricultural land. He was afraid Members did not really understand the state of things in the Eastern counties brought about by low prices, high taxes, and heavy rates. Largely owing to the incidence of rates, great tracts of land in Essex had gone out of cultivation, and the agricultural labour had gone out with it. They had, in fact, to eke out their existence with rabbits. When wheat was selling for 60s. per quarter and rates were low farmers were encouraged to cultivate corn, but now it cost 40s. per. acre to grow wheat, and the crop only fetched 25s. or 26s. per quarter, so that the industry was no longer a paying one. One cause of that was the incidence of rates—a burden which would be enormously increased if this Bill were passed. The landlords were doing as badly as any one else, for whereas a few years ago there were twenty men running after a vacant farm, there were now twenty farms running after each tenant. The farmers might be divided into two categories—those who were ruined, and those who were going to be. Those whom it was proposed to benefit by this Bill were between the upper and the nether millstone. Lord Beaconsfield and Lord Salisbury—men supposed to possess a certain amount of intuition and common sense—declared when Sir Robert Peel and Mr. Cobden took away the protection which agriculture had enjoyed some sixty years, that at the same time they ought to take off the land rates which the protective duties helped to pay. Now he noted that the people who were to become pensioners under the Bill were to retain their right to vote, but he failed to understand why a pensioner on the bounty of the country, doing nothing for the country, should be granted the right. Hon. Members were mistaken in thinking they were going to bring about a millennium in the agricultural districts by the Bills. He feared, indeed, that the position of the agricultural labourer in consequence of the heavier rates on the land would be a good deal worsened. They could not have an ideal agricultural existence in which every man walked about with a salary paid out of somebody else's pocket, and he therefore intended to vote against the Bill, because he did not want his agricultural friends or himself to be compelled to retire to the workhouse. He could only say in conclusion that since he had represented Essex Divisions in that House he had come to the conclusion that they contained the very epitome and incarnation of agricultural distress.

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich) rejoiced that the House was enabled to enjoy a little relaxation. He looked upon this debate as a mere Friday afternoon pastime. They were not seriously dealing with the question of old-age pensions. They were discussing the condition of administration before they had got the money. It was no use talking about cooking the hare before they had caught it. How rejoiced the public would be, and especially the working-class majority of it, when they read about the debate in the morning. It would be so filling to them. The question had been under consideration for 130 years, but they seemed as far off a settlement as ever. Sympathy was the cheapest commodity in the world nowadays. Some of the speeches made that afternoon led him to think hon. Members making them were not up to date in regard to Poor Law administration. He could not believe all the stories which had been told about workhouse classification and the condition of certain workhouses.

MR. JOHN HUTTON: I can assure the hon. Member the condition of things described does exist in certain workhouses in the North of England.

MR. CROOKS: Well, I think I know a great deal more about workhouses than the hon. Member.

MR. JOHN HUTTON: I have visited thirty-two.

MR. CROOKS: And I have visited something like 132. The hon. Member, continuing, said he had made it his business to go into the workhouses in any town he happened to be in and discover how the people were treated. Invariably any inquiry as to old-age pensions was met by the proposal to make the workhouses a little more comfortable. That was no solution of the difficulty. When he went into a workhouse he put certain questions to the inmates. They were almost stereotyped in his mind and the usual course of the conversation was this—

"How are you treated here?"—"Very well indeed."

"Are the master and matron kind?"—"Exceedingly kind."

"And the nurses?"—"Oh yes."

"Do you get a fair amount of liberty?"—"Yes."

"Is the food good?"—"Very good."

"And the bedding and clothes?"—"Yes, exceedingly good."

"And generally you have nothing to complain of?"—"No, no. Everybody is exceedingly kind, from the master to the guardians, but it is not home."

Could the House realise the meaning of these five words—"But it is not home." That was the end of an industrial, arduous life. Was the only remedy to make the workhouses more comfortable? Then there was the proposal to establish cottage homes, in which two old men, strangers to each other, were put in one room. Was that the ideal for which they lived and worked? He could take hon. Members to a union which had the reputation of being the Mecca of Poor Law administration. There they had provided cottage homes. In that workhouse the system of classification obtained. There were four different classes. Class A lived in cottage homes. Under the conditions, they must have lived in the district for twenty years, their poverty must have arisen from no fault of their own, and they must have no blemish upon their character. Could any Member of that House pass successfully an ordeal of that description? Who was to decide as to the blemish? It seemed to him that when a man or woman reached sixty-five years of age it ill became any one to talk about blemishes on their character. They had been foolish enough to get old, but not artful enough to get rich; but for Heaven's sake let them not talk about blemishes on their character. It was painful enough that they should be sixty-five years of age or more and in that position. The old man without a blemish upon his character was not always a good-tempered man. Old age did not improve temper, but it was not their fault; they could not help it. Just fancy two old men living in one room by themselves. He had visited these homes and he would tell the House what his experience was in one particular case. He saw one man in the room, and this conversation occurred—

"You are very comfortable here?"—"Think so."

"Nice place this?"—"Middling."

"That other chap who lives here; is he a decent old fellow?"—"Ah! you have got to live with people before you know them."

He then went into the garden and saw the other old man, who was doing a little bit of gardening. He said to him—

"You are living in Class A?"—"Yes, I'm Class A."

"That's seems to be a decent old chap with you?"—"Oh!"

"Decent old man that."—"Glad you think so"

And then Class A went on with his hoeing. Could hon. Members imagine these two old men sitting down together. Say they were at tea this might occur—

"Hand over the milk, will you?"—"Want it all?"

What a delightful existence as a reward for patient plodding industry! What these old people who had made England supreme in the commercial world, wanted and deserved was not a room in a cottage home with a companion who might not be very good-tempered, but a place at the fireside of their own relatives. They were entitled to have their own fireside in company with their sons and daughters, who were not sufficiently well off to support them, but could give them what money could not buy—love and sympathy. They laughed at sentiment in that House, and they sometimes talked maudlin sentiment, but the comradeship of life made life worth living, and it was as important to these people as it was to any hon. Member of that House. It had been suggested that the big employers should contribute to the old-age provision of their workpeople. What would the limited liability companies and the trusts say to that? It was an old saying that companies had neither bodies to be kicked nor souls to be damned. They did not care a straw what became of the men who worked for them. Besides, the need was greatest among men who never did more than casual labour. What employer was going to contribute to the old-age pensions of these men?

MR. CRIPPS said large firms and large railway companies had admirable systems to provide for their men in their old age.

MR. CROOKS remarked that that did not cover the case of the casual labourer, the men who were engaged in Essex at certain seasons with such regularity that it was a commonplace to say of a man, "He is in and out regularly." The money for old age pensions had to be found by the Exchequer. He would not quarrel as to who was to take the pension, but let them make a beginning somewhere and somehow. These veterans of labour had done as much to make the country's wealth as the soldiers and sailors had done to protect it; and to give them the hope of a pension would be to encourage and not to discourage thrift, because 5s. a week was in itself insufficient for decent comfort. But at present the man who tried to make provision for his old age was little better off than the man who did not try. People frequently dropped out of friendly societies because some change of fashion or improvement in machinery deprived them of their employment, and they could not keep up their contributions, and their experience discouraged others from joining. But with a certainty of 5s. a week from the State, young men, and young women for that matter, would join friendly societies in larger numbers than ever before and endeavour to keep up their subscriptions. Some of the best men and women that ever lived were people who, through no fault of their own, had been compelled to go to the Poor Law for relief. He had a case of that in his mind. He remembered a very fine old woman applying for relief. She was asked, "What do you want?" And the answer was, "I want some relief?" Then the conversation continued—

"Where is your husband?" "At home."

"What age are you?" "Seventy-one."

"And your husband's age?" "Seventy-three."

"How have you been living during the last twelve months?" "We have had six months full pay from our friendly society and six months half pay, now it has ceased and we will get no more."

"Have you any friends or relatives?" "No, we have outlived all our friends and relations and are alone in the world."

"Is there no one who will pay your rent so as to enable us to give you outdoor relief?" "No, no one."

"Then the law says you must go into the workhouse, we cannot make any allowance in payment of rent."

Let the House realise that. There they had a fine specimen of English womanhood, answering all questions perfectly clearly and frankly, and appealing to the guardians, "Oh, do not send us into the workhouse. I am able to look after my husband. We have a little home. Surely some one will do something to help us keep it." But the law said "no." He thought the nation might incur a little expenditure in increasing the comfort of these old people and giving them what they had earned, comfort and a decent subsistence in old age. But it was of small matter whether this Bill were read a second time or even a third time, because there was no money available for the scheme. Let them remember that by helping these veterans of labour they would be removing from the path of younger men with many responsibilities a source of competition, because in too many cases old men were employed solely because they were cheap.

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY (Yorkshire, Shipley) thought it useful that Unionists should be reminded of their past history in connection with this question, and of their duty in view of the absolute pledges they had given in the matter. During the election of 1895 the late Lord Salisbury coined the phrase "social amelioration," and there was no item in that programme of social amelioration which played so conspicuous a part in securing the victory of the Unionist Party on that occassion as that of old-age pensions. What had happened since then? Select Committees had considered various aspects of the question, and reported in favour of the establishment of a system of pensions, but nothing had been done. Year after year Bills had been introduced by private Members, and these had had the effect, at any rate, of showing that if the matter had been forgotton by the Government it had not been forgotton by their followers. Whether the present Bill were accepted or not, the perseverance of its promoters must have the effect of advancing the progress of this great and necessary reform, which was simply a measure of common justice to the workers who had outlived their strength. The great defect of the Bill was that it brought the recipient of a pension into more or less direct contact with the stigma of pauperism. The objection of the poor was not merely as regarded indoor relief as distinguished from outdoor relief; it was the sense of humiliation experienced by them at receiving anything from the hands of the Poor Law authorities. There were many other local authorities now established in the country to whom he believed the administration of a pension system might be entrusted, and by whom it could be carried out with success. In Denmark a system of pensions almost identical with that proposed by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham was in vogue. There were two classes of pensioners, viz., those persons who received their State pension from the local authority, and those who received outdoor relief, to which the badge of pauperism attached, under the ordinary Poor Law administration; and several years experience of that system had gone to show that the Poor Law expenditure had been substantially reduced by the separation of the respectable and deserving from the thriftless pauper class. He submitted that a similar result might be achieved in this country, and that the saving effected would go far towards recouping the pensions expenditure. In France and Belgium there were systems of old-age pensions confined to members of friendly societies, but there again the great point was that the badge of pauperism was avoided, and the recipients felt no more degradation than attached to the ordinary civil servant who drew his retiring allowance after years of service to the State. New Zealand, also, had a very complete system. Germany enjoyed a system under which the necessary funds were provided by contributions from the workers, the employers, and the State; the money passed through the Post Office, and he believed the scheme worked satisfactorily. The first essential of any such plan was that it should distinguish between the old respectable worker and the tramp or casual who had never done an honest day's work in his life. He would have no hesitation whatever in supporting the present Bill, and he hoped it would receive the sympathetic encouragement of the Government. In taking this course he did not delude himself with the hope that the measure would pass this session, but he believed it to be necessary that these discussions should be continued until the enthusiasm of the people and Parliament was aroused and the pledges which had been given were carried into effect.

COLONEL LOCKWOOD (Essex, Epping) said he had never given any pledge whatever in favour of State pensions. However much he might approve of them in the abstract, when it came to dealing with them in a concrete form he believed they were very far distant; how far distant he was not prepared to say. Everybody was agreed as to the sentimental aspect of the question. There was no division of opinion as to the individual hardships which pressed upon the poor who were brought to poverty through no fault of their own, and from that point of view he agreed that the present debate would do good in showing that the House of Commons was alive to the sufferings endured by these unfortunate people. Workhouses might be made more cheerful and more comfortable, but nobody who had been brought into contact with the feeling of horror entertained by the poor to those institutions could believe that by such means the workhouse would be popularised. What the old people wanted was simply to be left in the cottages in which they had lived all their lives. But when they passed from the sentimental to the practical aspect of the question, they were confronted with enormous difficulties. As a representative of a rural district, he was convinced that the necessary funds could not be raised by the imposition of any further burden on the local rates; while, as to making it an Imperial charge, that was so vast a question that he could not express any definite opinion upon it. He yielded to no man in his earnest desire to ameliorate the lot of those amongst whom he had passed the best part of his life, but he felt it to be impossible to support this Bill when he remembered that the funds would probably have to come out of the local rates.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.) said it was not necessary for him to state the views of the Government on this Bill, because it had been made perfectly clear that the majority of the hon. Members who had spoken had made up their minds that there was no prospect of this Bill receiving more than the sentimental, friendly, and useful consideration that it had met with during that debate. If the Bill were to rest upon its merits, judged by the speeches they had heard, it ought not to pass, because its main proposal of a provision for pensioners had been condemned by almost everybody who had spoken. There was no disagreement as to the principle of finding some system of pensions, but there was great practical difficulty in applying the principle of old-age pensions throughout the country. If they made up their minds to adopt an old-age pension scheme however much hedged round with conditions of all kinds, they would be driven from one safeguard after another until they would be forced to adopt a general and unlimited system. If that were so, what was the good of talking of £10,000,000? It would not be a question of £10,000,000 if they had a general system of pensions. In order to carry out the proposal suggested by the hon. Member for Woolwich they must have either a system in which every one would contribute by his subscription to the pension which he would ultimately draw, or else a wholesale grant by the State of pensions to everybody, without any limitation or conditions. He could not conceive it possible that the House of Commons would sanction the second alternative, at all events for many Parliaments to come.

The debate had been rendered more than usually interesting by a speech from the hon. Member for East Northamptonshire. How far the hon. Member was entitled to speak with authority or to disclose the plans of right hon. Gentlemen opposite he did not know. It was a matter of common knowledge that early in the session hon. Gentlemen opposite had made up their minds that there was soon to be a change in the constitution of this House, and it was generally asserted that they had gone so far as to allocate to various Members the different offices in the Government. The hon. Member for East Northamptonshire had made an interesting contribution to the debate, and if his view was shared by his Party then a most difficult task was before the next Liberal Chancellor of the Exchequer. Without limit or condition the hon. Member would have £26,000,000 taken from Imperial taxation. Then the hon. Member proceeded to tell them how the money could be raised, and he hoped that notice would be taken of the manner in which he suggested these extra funds could be provided. The method he suggested was a wholesale diminution of expenditure both upon the Navy and the Army and a new system of taxation which would give all the benefits to one class and lay all the burdens on a particular kind of property. That was not a proposal to which the Party at present in power would be likely to lend its assistance.

The speeches of the hon. Member for Woolwich on social questions were specially useful, for he spoke with knowledge of the poor and of Poor Law administration and without exaggeration. The hon. Member for Woolwich made a touching appeal to them to do something for these poor men and women whom he was sure they were all anxious to assist, and for whom a good deal had already been done. He thought the hon. Member would admit that a great deal had been done to enable outdoor relief to be freely administered so long as it was surrounded by safeguards which would prevent its abuse, instead of its being a real relief of destitution. They must not forget that outdoor relief was once a curse to this country, for it not only raised the rates ruinously, but it also pauperised the working classes. That state of things led to a reform, and since that time the Poor Law had been administered with a much firmer hand, and for a time it was administered, perhaps, with undue severity. He was glad that they had now reached a different state of things. He knew that much had been done to enable outdoor relief to be given with safeguards against abuse. Out of experience had grown reforms providing a more humane system of administration of relief without entrance into the workhouse. The terrible dread of the workhouse had no longer the reality which it had some years ago. In certain cases where poverty arose through no fault of their own, and where the poor had been industrious and well-conducted, the guardians could, and did, give outdoor relief, instead of offering them admission to the workhouse. He thought that was a great improvement.

Hon. Gentlemen who discussed this question were apt to talk as if by the creation of old-age pensions they would get rid of the poor and of the maintenance of the poor. The figures on this point were very interesting. The latest Returns showed that the total number of paupers, inclusive of vagrants and lunatics, on the 1st of September last year were 499,513, while the number of indoor paupers considered by the medical officers to be unable to take care of themselves was 58,000. But in addition to that 58,000 there was a very large proportion of those paupers over sixty who, although the medical officers were not prepared to certify them as unable to take care of themselves, would be hopelessly lost if the provision was to give them simply a few shillings per week without some other provision. By the creation of old-age pensions Poor Law maintenance would not be got rid of. A large proportion of the inmates of workhouses would be helpless unless some other provision were made for them. Cottage homes would meet the necessities of some; but there were difficulties and distinctions in the position of paupers in towns and in rural districts; and whether the poor were to be treated by old-age pensions or by classification in the workhouse or outside no general rules could be laid down declaring this or that was not possible or capable of application. Discussions such as they had had would help the working out of the problem, and neither Party could claim a monopoly of interest in the subject. By all means let them do all they could to improve the conditions under which the poor lived, but, as practical men, they ought not to ignore the fact that, during the last fifty years a great deal had been done in this direction, enormous strides had been made, and constantly small changes of a practical character were being effected in the system of Poor Law relief which tended to the comfort of the poor without degrading or pauperising them in any way whatever. Any system of old-age pensions must be kept altogether distinct from Poor Law administration, the funds must be provided and administered under a totally different system, any attempt to provide them from the rates would be strenuously resisted. If the funds came out of Imperial taxation, localities could not distribute them, and there must be a system of distribution of a central character. The Government had not forgotten all that had been said about old-age pensions, though they had not taken action in the matter. If the Party opposite had forgotten the programmes they had not carried out, nine-tenths of their political faith would be gone. Because the Government had not been able to find from £10,000,000 to £25,000,000 for old-age pensions it should not be assumed they had forgotten all they had said on the subject or ceased to take interest in it. This was not a question of providing machinery. It was a question of finding out of the taxation of the country the millions that must be found if a scheme of this kind was to be adopted. Until a Government was in a position to find the millions that were required it was idle to suppose that such a proposal could be carried into effect. The present Government was not in a position to do so; and though hon. Gentlemen opposite might declare themselves in favour of the scheme, he would be very much surprised if when they changed their seats they did not also change their views.

Sir WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston) said that although it was quite true that the whole of the Newcastle Programme had not been carried out the right hon. Gentleman should not forget that the Liberal Party had only been in office two and a half years out of the last fifteen years, while the Unionist Party had been in power the whole of the remaining period. Consequently, the comparison of the right hon. Gentleman was not a fair one. Although a scheme had been brought forward which contained the nucleus of a practical measure, no hope had been held out of any scheme of old-age pensions coming into force. This had, after all, been a barren and academical discussion, and the practical difficulty which the right hon. Gentleman opposite had put before the country was that there was no money to carry out such a scheme. It did seem to him that the right hon. Gentleman ought to have declared what was the policy of the Government with reference to this Bill. He presumed that hon. Members opposite were to be allowed to vote as they liked, and that it was not going to be made a Government question. He did not think such an attitude as that towards a measure of this kind was very creditable to the right hon. Gentleman, who ought to have made up his mind, and should have given the House a definite statement in regard to the policy of the Government. This Bill was one which he did not altogether like, and no scheme would ever be acceptable to the poor which contained an element of the Poor Law administration in it. Therefore the right hon. Gentleman ought to have told the House what his attitude was. He did not regard the Bill as being by any means a perfect measure. He did not like the principle of discrimination and selection, in regard to those who were to receive pensions, by the Poor Law guardians. Old-age pensions in order to be popular must be administered by a department entirely different from that which administered the Poor Law, and he felt that on that point particularly they ought to have had a more distinct statement from the Government. A pensioners' scheme administered by a separate authority, with little to do besides see to the qualifications of the applicants, and which would pay its pensions through the Post Office, would take away from the Poor Law a large number of people who were now recipients of relief. Under such a scheme the Poor Law administration would be relieved of a burden which no system of classification would ever remove, and then the Poor Law administrators would be able to carry out those improvements to which the right hon. Gentleman had alluded. During the last few years a great deal had been done to make the administration of the Poor Law more humane and tender, and there must always be in the workhouses a large number of aged persons who could not live outside even with old-age pensions. They were now pleading for veterans of industry who had earned by long years of toil the right to a decent and honourable maintenance, in their old age, entirely unstained by a trace of pauperism, and it was in regard to that class of people that he thought they ought to have a more distinct statement from the Government as to their intentions with reference to this Bill.

SIR J. FERGUSSON (Manchester, N. E.) said he believed that universal pensions would be an impossibility, but he thought something might be done for that margin which overflowed the limit of Poor Law relief by preserving the aged poor from pauperism on the one hand and from semi-starvation on the other. If the Bill went to a Second Reading he should vote for it, because he believed that it was not impossible to make something of it, and because he thought it was not creditable to the House that the matter should be discussed year after year and nothing come of it.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH (Bristol, W.) was surprised at the speech of his right hon. friend who had just sat down. He evidently did not believe that this was a workable measure, yet he proposed to vote for the Second Reading on the ground of sentiment. He thought the House ought to be honest. Did any of them really believe that it was possible for an old-age pension scheme to become law? There was much which would dispose many of them to vote in favour of the principle of old-age pensions on the ground of sentiment; but the more the subject had been examined the more impossible, to his mind, it had become to carry out any scheme consistently with any possible charge that could be put either on the ratepayers or the taxpayers. If that were so, he thought they owed it to the people of this country that they should have the courage of their convictions. If they believed the scheme was impossible they ought to vote against the Second Reading of this Bill.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed for Monday next.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have passed a Bill, entitled, "An Act to amend the Law in relation to the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children." [Sale of Intoxicants to Children Bill [Lords].

NEW BILL.

OUTDOOR RELIEF (FRIENDLY SOCIETIES) (No. 3) BILL.

Bill to amend the Outdoor Relief (Friendly Societies) Act, 1894, ordered to be brought in by Sir Edward Strachey, Sir Albert Rollit, Sir Harry Samuel, Sir William Holland, and Mr. Rigg.

OUTDOOR RELIEF (FRIENDLY SOCIETIES) (No. 3) BILL.

"To amend the Outdoor Relief (Friendly Societies) Act, 1894," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 188.]

OLD AGE PENSIONS (No. 3) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged; Bill withdrawn.

RE-VACCINATION BILL.

Order for Second Reading upon Monday, 16th May, read, and discharged; Bill withdrawn.

Adjourned at twenty-four minutes before Six o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Monday, 9th May, 1904.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The Lord Chancellor acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with:—Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (Birmingham) [H.L.]; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 2).

And also the Certificates that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with:—Harrow Road and Paddington Tramways; Donegal Railway.

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

Wolverhampton Corporation Bill. Report from His Majesty's Attorney-General received, and ordered to lie on the Table.

Manchester Ship Canal Bill [H.L.]. A witness ordered to attend the Select Committee.

Trafford Park Dock and Railway Bill [H.L.]. Witnesses ordered to attend the Select Committee.

South Shields Gas Bill. The Lord Balfour informed the House that the opposition to the Bill was withdrawn. The orders made on the 19th of April and Monday last discharged, and Bill committed.

Ipswich Dock Commission Bill [H.L.]. Commons Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Richard Jaeger's Patent Bill [H.L.]. Committed.

Hutchesons' Hospital and Hutchesons' Educational Trust Bill [H.L.]; Chippenham Gas Bill; Sheppy Gas Bill; North Staffordshire Railway Bill; London, Tilbury, and Southend Railway Bill. Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Lord Estcourt be proposed to the House as a member of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Lord Aberdare; read, and agreed to.

Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Bill. Read 2^a, and committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

Marylebone Chapels (St. James, Westmoreland Street) Bill [H.L.]; Minehead Urban District Council Water Bill [H.L.]; West Riding Tramways Bill [H.L.]. Read 3^a, and passed, and sent to the Commons.

Doncaster Corporation Bill; Strabane, Raphoe, and Convoy Railway, Bill; Surrey Commercial Dock Bill. Brought from the Commons; read 1^a; and referred to the Examiners.

Huddersfield Corporation Act, 1902 (Amendment) Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments.

Great Eastern Railway (Steamboats) Bill. Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to.

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (Birmingham) Bill [H.L.]. To be read 2^a To-morrow.

Metropolitan Common Scheme (Hillingdon East) Provisional Order Bill; Metropolitan Common Scheme (Farnborough) Provisional Order Bill. Read 3^a (according to order), and passed.

Metropolitan Police Provisional Order Bill. Read 2^a (according to order), and committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

PETITIONS.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES (METRIC SYSTEM) BILL [H.L.].

Petition in favour of; of Bedfordshire County Council; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

STREET BETTING BILL [H.L.].

Petition in favour of; of Scarborough Branch of Anti-Gambling League; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Code of regulations for public elementary schools; with schedules.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

No. 3153. Germany.

No. 3154. Turkey (Aleppo and Adana).

No. 3155. China (Swatow).

No. 3156. Greece (Morea, Aetolia, and Acarnania).

No. 3157. Argentine Republic (Rosario).

No. 3158. China (Wuhu).

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) CONTINUATION CLASSES.

Reports, Statistics, etc., 1902–1903.

RAILWAY AND CANAL TRAFFIC ACTS, 1854 TO 1894

Fifteenth Annual Report of the Railway and Canal Commission; with Appendix.

CROFTER HOLDINGS (SCOTLAND) ACTS, 1886-1887.

Reports by the Crofters Commission, being for the year ended 31st December, 1903.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

LUNACY.

Report to the Lord Chancellor of the number of visits paid, the number of patients seen, and the number of miles travelled by the visitors of lunatics, pursuant to the Lunacy Act, 1890, between 1st October, 1903, and 1st March, 1904.

POLLING DISTRICTS (COUNTY OF MIDDLESEX).

Orders, made by the County Council of Middlesex, altering certain polling districts in the Tottenham Parliamentary Division.

UNIVERSITIES (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1889.

Annual Statistical Report, by the University Court of the University of St. Andrew's, to the Secretary for Scotland, under the provisions of Section 30 of the Universities (Scotland) Act, 1889, for the year 1902–1903.

Annual Report on the State of the finances of the University of St. Andrew's under the provisions of Section 30 of the Universities (Scotland) Act, 1889, for the year 1902–1903.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

TIBET.

LORD REAY: My Lords, seeing the noble Earl the Under-Secretary of State for India in his place, I beg to ask whether he can give the House any additional information concerning events in Tibet.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (The Earl of HARDWICKE): My Lords, the Secretary of State for India has received the following telegram from Lord Ampthill, dated 8th inst.—

> "Macdonald reports Colonel Brander, 6th May, attacked 2,500 Tibetans, strongly entrenched beyond Karo-La Pass. After four hours stubborn fighting, enemy was defeated and retreated. Enemy's loss not yet known. Loss on our side: 32nd Bengal Infantry, Captain Bethune and three men killed, and thirteen men wounded; 8th Goorkhas, one man wounded. All quite at Gyangtse on the 6th May."

That is all the information I can give the noble Lord. I may say that this telegram has been already communicated to the Press.

EDUCATION (TRANSFERRED SCHOOLS) BILL [H.L.].

[FIRST READING.]

THE LORD BISHOP OF ST. ASAPH: My Lords, in asking leave to present a Bill relating to education I desire at the outset to make one fact clear. I am wholly and solely responsible for the measure submitted to your Lordships. I have not sought the advice or support of those leaders and organisations with whom I might naturally be supposed to be in communication. The Bill comes before your Lordships simply on its own merits, and compromises no one except its author. I recognise that the lonely presumption involved in such a step calls for some explanation. Although the Bill and the problem with which it attempts to deal are in no sense limited to the Principality, the circumstances that suggested such a measure occurred in Wales.

The Act of 1902 aroused in Wales as well as in England slumbering antipathies, almost precisely in the same measure and intensity as happened after the passing of the Act of 1870. Last year the county councils of Wales invited the representatives of the voluntary schools to meet them, with a view to effecting a friendly arrangement for the management of the voluntary schools, and providing that the interests of religious education

> "should be safe-guarded on the lines of the syllabus of some of the larger School Boards, supplemented by facilities, where demanded by the parents, for special religious instruction, to be provided by the denomination requiring it, on the Colonial plan."

Although the invitation was courteous and generous, there were some who naturally doubted whether Wales offered the best soil and climate for so tender a plant as a concordat, and they therefore declined the invitation. However, in North Wales, representatives of the voluntary schools met the committee of the county councils. The conferences and negotiations, conducted in the most friendly spirit, brought out two interesting facts. In the first place it appeared that the managers and the teachers actually engaged in the work of the schools were singularly destitute of any experience or consciousness of that religious difficulty which is so acutely felt by many public speakers. Moreover this difficulty assumed reasonable and manageable proportions when it came to be discussed in private by those who, to use the graphic phrase of the most distinguished representative of the county councils,

> "Had not got their war paint on."

In quoting the terms then agreed upon I wish very distinctly to say that those terms do not now bind or compromise anyone. It was agreed that in all the schools in the area under discussion a syllabus of religious instruction on the lines of the London School Board syllabus should be taught from 9 to 9.45 a.m. on four days in the week in provided schools, and on three days in the week in the non-provided schools, and that there should be facilities in provided schools for unrestricted religious teaching on one day to the children of those parents who desired it, and that on two days there should be facilities given in the non-provided schools for unrestricted religious teaching; and that there should be an annual examination. It was also agreed, but under protest, and as an experiment, that—

> "The teachers may, if willing, give the unrestricted religious instruction in provided as well as in non-provided schools."

Those were the terms asked for and agreed to upon what is, of course, the centre of the whole difficulty, the religious question.

In considering those terms, I was urged to their acceptal, not because they would solve a present and irritating difficulty, but because those terms would have secured substantial and systematic religious teaching in all the board schools in the area. And later on I shall show that this was a strong reason for their acceptal. Why then, it may be asked, did the concordat fail? Not from any misgiving as to the sincerity of those who offered those terms, but for the insuperable objection, to my mind, that the concordat lacked legal sanction and legal security. Had that concordat been carried out, and its loyal fulfilment legally secured, we should not only have had educational peace, but, what I value much more, we should have had real and systematic religious instruction in all the elementary schools in the area concerned. After that experience, I think I realise fully now, not only the strength and the weakness of both sides, but the possibility of finding by moderation and conciliation a solution for the difficulties, so grave and often so unedifying, that now trouble our schools.

I have therefore made bold to bring this Bill before your Lordships. In its main principle it is a natural extension of the principle of the Act of 1902. It clothes the local education authority created by that Act with a power which will facilitate the adjustment and adaptation of that Act to meet the special conditions of the locality. Under that Act, the necessity for the provision of a new school is in a measure to be decided by the wishes of the parents. Upon the same principle I propose that the parents should have what seems to me to be the incontrovertible right of a parent, viz., the right to decide the character of the religious instruction given to his child. The Bill would give the local education authority and the governing body of any association of voluntary schools, if so authorised by their managers, power to make an arrangement with reference to the transfer of their schools.

I believe you can safely entrust these bodies with freedom of contract. The local education authority and the Schools Association represent organisations that are not too large for local knowledge, and not too small for common sense. If the local education authorities are worthy to be entrusted with the secular management of all the elementary schools in their area, they can surely be entrusted with the freedom asked for them in the Bill, and I am confident that the associations and managers of voluntary schools will be strong enough to protect their own interests. The Bill would give both sides a free hand in making arrangements touching control, the appointment of teachers, the religious instruction given in the schools, and the renting, leasing, and repairing of the buildings. I lay great stress upon the opportunity which such an arrangement would give of promoting the cause of religious instruction in all the elementary schools within the area.

I will illustrate this from Wales and Monmouthshire, where there are 320,000 children in all the elementary schools. Of that number 90,000 are in non-provided schools, and less than 80,000 of these children are in Church of England schools. Put briefly, only one in four of the children under education in Wales are being taught in our Church schools. How religious instruction stands in the board schools is shown in the Blue-book of 1895. There are 307 School Board districts in Wales and Monmouthshire. Only in fifty-four out of that number is there any syllabus of religious instruction, and only in seventeen is there any examination in religious knowledge.

This brings me to the question of undenominational instruction. A careful perusal of the Blue-book I have named demonstrates how vague and misleading that phrase is. In the great majority of the Welsh board schools, undenominational instruction means reading of the Bible without comment. What exactly happens—I speak from knowledge—is this. At 9 o'clock the head teacher reads to the assembled school, without note or comment, three, sometimes five, verses, taken haphazard from the Bible. Even in the few schools where comment is allowed, this reservation occurs frequently—

> "That no reference is to be made to the doctrines taught therein."

This is one type of undenominational teaching. In the Appendix to the Blue-book another type is given in the syllabuses of religious instruction given in various English Board schools. I find in some of those syllabuses that the Apostles Creed is taught; that the duties as inculcated in our own Catechism, only phrased in the exact language of Scripture, are taught, and that these syllabuses in the subjects specified, and in the time allotted to them, compare not unfavourably with some of our own diocesan syllabuses. And yet this, too, is called undenominational instruction.

What is the explanation of the wide and deep difference between these two types? The Cowper-Temple clause, interpreted in the spirit of its framers, not only allows but anticipated such a syllabus of religious instruction as I have quoted. The point is not only academic but of vital interest. The Welsh School Boards supply the type of that undenominational instruction which Mr. Gladstone called at one time "the popular imposture," at another time "the monster." In the debate in June, 1870, on the Cowper-Temple clause, Mr. Gladstone said that he regarded

> "an attempt to exclude all reference to tenets and doctrines as an invasion of the freedom of religious teaching, such as ought not to be tolerated in this country."

And he made it clear that the Cowper-Temple clause did not in his view

> "impose limitations upon the freedom of religious teaching."

In the same debate, Sir Roundell Palmer said that he regarded the Cowper-Temple clause as preserving substantially the integrity of religious teaching, and he added these words, that—

> "Distinctive catechisms and formularies were necessarily symbolical of the predominance of particular denominations, and although convenient and useful, they were not necessary for the integrity and freedom of religious truth and teaching."

I submit that the undenominational teaching I have described is a local and unauthoritative interpretation or gloss which has been put upon the Cowper-Temple clause. The practical point then is this, ought we not, as Churchmen, to take every opportunity of securing in the board schools of this country the full freedom and liberty of religious instruction allowed and contemplated by the Cowper-Temple clause?

These considerations may minimise the necessity but not the justice of the claim for facilities. In Wales, we were invited to consider facilities upon the Colonial plan. The Education Act passed in 1880 by the Legislature of New South Wales is an admirable illustration of how inside facilities may be provided. On the ground of justice, I cannot see how the State can refuse the claims of parents to have their own children taught their own faith at the cost of their own denomination in the public elementary schools of the country. No doubt there may be practical difficulties in providing facilities in some remote country parishes where there is only a provided school. Even here in London, where it is calculated that there are 300,000 Church children in board schools, it might be difficult at a day's notice to provide a permanent, adequate, and efficient organisation for so vast a work.

I need not at this stage discuss further details in the Bill. It may be said, my Lords, that these proposals are founded too exclusively upon a Welsh experience. Perhaps the symptoms in Wales are more pronounced, and therefore easier of diagnosis, but the trouble in England and Wales is really the same. The measure I present to your Lordships is entirely permissive. For example, in my own diocese there is a portion of the county of Shropshire, and no arrangement is necessary in that staid and admirable county. And the same applies to many other parts of the country. I cannot explain why the Principality suggested itself as a fitting subject, when the Free Church Council had said *Experimentum fiat*. But, my Lords, I do not complain of this—I do not complain of the tropical eloquence in which criticism of the Education Act luxuriates, but I think there is one very strong ground for complaint.

It is an open secret that the protagonists in the opposition to the Act are in favour of a purely secular system of education in our elementary schools. Let them say so clearly. We shall then know exactly where we are, and there will be a clear issue before the country, I know intimately many leading Nonconformists, and I know well that they will not support the policy of secular schools. To me the great danger ahead appears to be that while religious men are wrangling about the form of instruction to be given, the secularist will meanwhile steal the key of the schools. I believe this Bill would do much in many cases to avert that evil, and in that belief I now venture to present the measure for your Lordships' consideration.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 1ª."—(*The Lord Bishop of St. Asaph.*)

EARL SPENCER: My Lords, I do not rise to oppose the First Reading of this Bill, nor do I intend to follow the right rev. Prelate in the interesting speech which he has delivered. I might be tempted to refer to several points he has made, but I do not propose to do that, as I believe the proper occasion for a full discussion of this important measure will be when it comes up for Second Reading. I rise for the purpose only of informing the right rev. Prelate and his friends, and of stating publicly, that certain portions of the Bill will probably meet with very strong opposition. The Bill has not yet been printed, but as I understand from the remarks of the right rev.

Prelate, it will give a *locus standi* to different denominations to teach the doctrines of their own particular denomination in provided schools within the school hours. Well, I do not wish to go into that question now. I merely warn the right rev. Prelate that if that is the purport of his Bill he may expect very strong opposition to it. If he proposes to do that, he certainly goes very much further than the Bill of the Government in 1902, which in that respect left the religious question as it was. He raises a very serious and a very difficult question, and, therefore, I have thought it right on the introduction of the Bill to make this statement.

THE LORD BISHOP OF ST. DAVID'S: My Lords, though it is not without some diffidence that I venture to address your Lordships for the first time, I feel personally bound to ask the indulgence of the House for a few brief observations upon the introduction of this Bill, because in the spring of last year, in common with the Bishops of Llandaff and Bangor, I failed to see my way to co-operate with the right rev. Prelate in the negotiations for an educational concordat to which he has referred. I explained at the time to my own diocese my reasons for a decision to which I necessarily came with great regret. Though I continue of the opinion which I formed last year, that it would not have conduced to that educational peace which all men of goodwill must always desire for all the Welsh dioceses to have accepted the invitation of certain Welsh education authorities to a conference, the basis of which, under the circumstances then existing, was impracticable—I have, nevertheless, always recognised that the diocese of St. Asaph—where the proportion of Church schools to the population stands exceptionally high, and in the welfare of which I have reason for taking deep interest—was fully justified in exploring for itself, in detail, all the possibilities of a satisfactory concordat. A certain amount of risk to the common cause from their several points of view was obviously incurred by both parties to those limited negotiations, but I am persuaded that the net result, upon the whole, has been an appreciable gain in a clearer apprehension of the principles hitherto regarded locally on either side as essential, and also of the legal conditions under which it might be possible to submit to the test of experience the practicability of adjusting conflicting principles by means of a local concordat initiated and maintained through the power of goodwill.

The St. Asaph negotiations failed, as I understand, mainly, if not solely, because without some modification of the existing law adequate security could not be given by local education authorities for the effectiveness of proposals in regard to which both sides had then come, rightly or wrongly, to a substantial agreement. This being so it is easy to understand that the right rev. Prelate has deemed it his duty to follow up his previous negotiations by asking Parliament to remove the existing legal disability upon local option which last year barred the way to the desired concordat. Though this Bill is thus the logical outcome of the St. Asaph negotiations, it is capable of wider application and would cover a considerable variety of proposals for local agreements. It might have, I believe, a practical bearing upon the possible revival of somewhat similar proposals which have been under more or less definite consideration in several parts of England. But Parliament is not asked in this Bill to approve of the particular lines of either the St. Asaph concordat or any other concordat which has been suggested. All that the Bill proposes to do, as I understand, is to make legally practicable in England and Wales the application of the principle of local option in order to facilitate various local experiments in educational conciliation. Its underlying principle of local option therefore has a considerable degree of affinity to the Scottish plan, which has recently received some instructive, and, I may add, unexpected compliments, from both sides in another place.

There is, I think, when the proper time comes, in view of all the present educational circumstances of this country, something to be said against as well as for this application of local option. But without at present committing myself at all either for or against the Bill, the text of which I have not yet seen, I gladly support its First Reading, since it is an attempt at conciliation founded upon experience, and as such certainly deserves the careful consideration of Parliament and the country. In the careful consideration which I hope this Bill will receive from different points of view before it comes on for Second Reading a prominent place should be given to the necessity of earnest good will on both sides before local option as a step towards the permanent solution of the religious difficulty can be expected to succeed. What are the immediate prospects of such a growth of goodwill? I need not remind your Lordships of the unfortunate form in which strong feeling on one side of this educational controversy has been manifested by large numbers in England. But as an illustration of the attitude of managers of Church schools in my own diocese, I may remind your Lordships that Mr. A. P. Lawrence, K.C., in his recent Report to the Board of Education upon the Carmarthenshire public inquiry, presented to both Houses of Parliament, stated that—

> "No suggestion was made in cross-examination of any sort of sectarian narrowness on the part of any manager. The managers called before me were remarkable for their open-minded and liberal disposition towards the Nonconformist scholars."

Before the Education Act came into operation in any part of the diocese of St. David's, with the exception of one or two boroughs, the governing body of the St. David's Association of Schools recommended managers in districts where there was only a Church school to avail themselves of the provision of the Act enabling them to appoint a Nonconformist assistant teacher, and also in the exercise of their powers under the Act so to arrange the time-table of religious instruction in all schools as to confine the use of distinctive Church formularies to two specified hours in the week, providing, when desired by parents, alternative hours in Holy Scripture for Nonconformist children at the hours when lessons in distinctive Church formularies were given to Church children.

The sole object of these spontaneous recommendations was to facilitate the application of the equitable principle that it is the duty and right of parents to decide what religious instruction their children are to receive in elementary schools. I earnestly wish I could also have adduced similar evidence of the general existence of corresponding goodwill on the part of the Welsh local education authorities. It is, on the contrary, notorious that Welsh county councils have adopted the short-sighted policy of unfair discrimination against voluntary schools in educational administration. Feeling over differences is apt to run rather higher in Wales than in England But, on the other hand, it must not be forgotten that the possibilities of recovery contained in the generosity and good sense of the Welsh people are great. As things now stand, however, the fact remains that the present attitude of the Welsh county councils towards voluntary schools is, as far as Wales is concerned, a most serious obstacle in the way of educational peace. Whenever this obstacle is removed and solid evidence of earnest goodwill on both sides alike is forthcoming, I do not for my part despair of a gradual solution of this religious difficulty, which has for so many years in England as well as in Wales retarded educational progress and obscured the unifying root-principle of our common Christianity.

Earl CAWDOR: My Lords, having been brought more closely in contact with recalcitrant county councils than many of your Lordships, I may, perhaps, be excused for rising to speak on this subject. The Bill which the right rev. Prelate has introduced appears to offer no excuse for not reading it a first time, for, as far as I can gather, it is mere an enabling Bill. I was very glad to hear from the noble Earl who leads the Opposition that the only comment he had to make upon it was that those parts of the Bill which referred to provided schools would receive careful scrutiny, and, possibly, opposition at his hands. But the main part of the Bill deals with non-provided schools, and I hope the noble Earl will give those clauses his favourable consideration. I do not wish to go into any of the details of the measure, which, of course, would be more properly dealt with when the Bill comes up for Second Reading, but there are points in it to which I should like to draw your Lordships' attention. It appears to be so far an enabling Bill that nothing will come to pass under its provisions unless county councils and voluntary school managers and trustees concur in making an agreement under it. Further, in so far as non-provided schools are concerned, in the event of the agreement coming to an end after a term of years, those schools would revert to the exact position they occupied before, and would not be taken over as provided under the Act of 1902 and considered in the light of new schools. Therefore, in the event of the agreement proving not satisfactory, these schools would go back into the same position that they were in before the agreement was made.

With regard to one matter to which, no doubt, considerable attention will be called—the modification of the Cowper-Temple clause—I might observe that there does not appear to be any great change with regard to the effect of that clause so far as non-provided schools are concerned. Denominational teaching is given in the non-provided schools now, and any agreement which provided for that denominational teaching to be continued in the event of a non-provided school being taken over by the county council would be merely a continuation of what exists at the present time. I think the Bill deserves careful consideration at the hands of your Lordships. It is brought forward by a right rev. Prelate who is not remiss in defending what he considers matters of principle worth defending, but is known also throughout the length and breadth of the land to be ready to compromise if he can maintain the principles he thinks essential to his case.

I do not know whether your Lordships fully appreciate the condition of affairs in parts of the country in which the Act of 1902 has not been brought into force. In certain cases it is not merely a refusal to bring the Act into force such as has been described this evening. There is a good deal more besides that. In certain cases attendance officers have been prevented from doing their duty in so far as non-provided schools are concerned. Where the attendance officer was assumed to be serving both provided and non-provided schools, he has received instructions from the county council to pay no further attention whatever to the attendance in non-provided schools; and where attendance officers were merely serving non-provided districts and non-provided schools their services have been dispensed with, and there is no attendance officer in those districts at all. The result is simply disastrous upon the attendance at those schools. I am informed that in one county alone the diminution in the attendance in non-provided schools brought about in this way will result in the loss in that county of Government grants to the extent of not less than £4,000 or £5,000.

It is not so much the actual results at the moment that we must look at. We must look deeper into the matter and see what the eventual results are likely to be. This is not only a refusal to administrate an Act, but it is a deliberate attempt to make use of the powers conferred by Act of Parliament on local authorities in order to injure and hamper non-provided schools. I would suggest that the first duty of the Government and of Parliament is to vindicate the law. Defiance of the law in an individual is a serious thing enough; defiance of the law by local authorities is, to my mind, a far more serious matter. If it is not checked—and rapidly checked—by a firm hand, it must prove a serious danger to the State and to the community at large. Defiance of one particular law must surely lead inevitably, if gradually, to the defiance and the contempt of law in general. There is, to my mind, no greater danger than to allow individuals or local bodies to get it into their heads that they can defy any law that Parliament has passed. Therefore, while I hope your Lordships will read this Bill a first time, and while I am sure your Lordships will give to its further passage through the House your earnest consideration, I would urge upon His Majesty's Government that the Bill they have introduced in another place should, for the reasons that I have ventured to place before your Lordships, be pushed on vigorously and without delay. If there is any necessity for such a Bill at all, it should not be allowed to lie for many days on the Table, but should be passed as soon as possible into law.

*THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: My Lords, it is inconvenient, indeed impossible, to discuss, even on the basis of so lucid a speech as that of the right rev. Prelate who introduced this Bill, the details of a measure not yet in your Lordships' hands. Obviously it is not at this stage that profitable detailed discussion can be carried on; but I should like to say a few words upon the principle that presumably underlies the action of the right rev. Prelate in endeavouring to promote some peaceful and harmonious solution of the difficulties which unhappily beset us in this matter, difficulties which must be a cause of genuine distress to every religious man. The speech of my right rev. brother was clear and incisive as his speeches always are, and it had the further advantage of being based on wide and thoroughgoing information and such knowledge as is second to none on the Episcopal Bench. But with a discretion which he is quite within his right in exercising he has felt it to be best to introduce this Bill—I do not for a moment say he was wrong—on his individual responsibility; and, as he has, I believe, already explained to your Lordships, the Bill is not to be taken as in any way a joint production of the Episcopal Bench or the result of consultation on our part as a whole.

I confess I was a little disappointed in listening to the few words which fell from the noble Earl who leads the Opposition. I had hoped we might at least have had a kindly word of welcome to the endeavour which, wise or unwise as it may be in detail, at all events is an attempt to bring about a harmonious solution of existing difficulties. The noble Earl confined himself to a warning, from what the right rev. Prelate told us about the Bill, that we must expect that one at least of its principles would receive strenuous opposition. I was disappointed in this because as I have always believed no one is more anxious and keen than the noble Earl to further some solution of the difficulty we have had to face for the last two years. But I should like to say this. Although, as the right rev. Prelate has said, this Bill is his own product and we, the other Bishops, are not responsible for it, it does not stand by itself, but is only one among many endeavours we have made to arrive at a peaceful solution. I myself six months ago endeavoured to my utmost power to bring about a conference or discussion with leaders among our opponents (if I must call them so), on the religious part of this controversy, in order to see whether there was any solution attainable that did not appear on the surface. I tried in a letter which I addressed to my friend Dr. Horton to lay down the main principles from which we could in no wise depart, and I hoped that, granting these as common to both sides, we might discuss the details of their application. Those principles were three. First, that simple religious teaching should prevail throughout our elementary school system; secondly, that that religious teaching should be given by those who could give it genuinely as well as effectively; and, further, that in the large system of our elementary education as a whole, place should certainly be found for denominational teaching of some sort. Those principles being laid down, I hoped that it would have been possible to have a friendly conference on the best mode of applying them. I failed. I was told that unless we abandoned at once the principle that the person giving religious teaching should be one whose qualifications for that task might be inquired into and ascertained a conference was impossible. It was disappointing, and particularly so because I honestly fail to understand wherein lies the need for such a severance.

I have tried with perfect fairness to bring to a point the difficulties which are felt by those who have opposed the Church on this particular matter. We find our opponents laying down the principle, and they would be indignant were we not to accept it, that they are as keen as we are for religious teaching being given, and yet so strong is their objection to what they describe as tests that they will have no inquiry made about the teacher to whom that great task is to be entrusted. There I feel it to be impossible for me and those who feel with me to give way; nothing, to my mind, would be more contrary to reason or common sense than that we should lay down the principle that religious teaching shall be given, and that at the same time we should decline to allow managers to find out whether those who are to give it are, or are not, qualified for the duty. This objection to all inquiry is now strangely said to form an inherent part of the Liberal creed; but it seems to me wholly incompatible with a common-sense view, to take no higher standpoint. If a man is about to give teaching in drawing, will you not satisfy yourself that he can draw? In this higher matter, is it reasonable to sanction or enjoin the giving of religious teaching to little children unless you know that the man or woman who is to give such teaching can be trusted to give it genuinely as well as effectively? We are met with the reply, "See how well the system works to-day; you have commended the teaching in the London board schools; why not trust in like manner to the working of a similar system throughout the country?" I am almost ashamed to repeat again the answer to that argument, but I find it necessary to go on repeating it because it seems to be continually forgotten. Of the head teachers in the London board schools all but a trifling fraction have been trained in religious training colleges, and with that training behind them have become headmasters and headmistresses. But all will now be changed, owing to the power which the new Act most rightly gives to county councils and other authorities to make provision for the training of teachers at the public expense. They will be empowered to arrange for the training of elementary teachers in their own way, but they will be unable to make as a necessary part of the training such teachers receive, any instruction how to impart the religion they will be required to teach. Before many years pass teachers untrained in religious teaching will be found all through the country unless you make it to be the interest of those who apply for posts in elementary schools to be able to show they are qualified to give religious as well as other teaching.

I mention this because it falls in with the argument touched upon by my right rev. brother when he spoke of the teaching usually given in Board schools to day. I retract no word I have ever used about the excellence of a great deal of the religious teaching given in Board schools under such Boards as those of London, of Liverpool and, in recent years, of Birmingham. The noble Lord, Lord Reay, who has presided over the London Board, and Lord Stanley, who has been a prominent member, know that the teachers who fill the chief posts in London have nearly all been religiously trained. But that is not true of the country as a whole, and will become less true as time goes on. As we have heard from the right rev. Prelate, and I could expand the statistics he gave, there are a vast number of Board schools throughout the country where nominally religious teaching has been given; but, inasmuch as it has never been examined or inspected, there are no means of knowing, except by private information, which sometimes leads one to sad conclusions, whether that teaching is given with any efficiency. It is just because London, Birmingham, and other towns are constantly held up to observation as though they were typical of all Board school teaching that we need to draw attention to the peril involved in going forward without making any such arrangement as shall ensure that religious teaching is given by teachers genuinely qualified to give it. As regards the proposals of the Bill, I need not say with what great attention I shall study them when they are printed and placed in our hands. It is impossible for me to say more at present than that I most earnestly desire to see a harmonious conclusion brought to the difficulties which attend the working of the Education Act, if such a conclusion can be arrived at without any sacrifice of the fundamental principles for which we who care so deeply for real religious teaching have from the first contended.

THE LORD PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL AND PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (The Marquess of LONDONDERRY): My Lords, my first duty is to express to the right rev. Prelate who moved the First Reading of this Bill my gratitude to him for his courtesy in consulting my convenience in regard to the day selected for the introduction of the Bill, and I trust he will not consider me guilty of any discourtesy if my remarks on this occasion are brief. It has always been the custom in your Lordships' House never to oppose the First Reading of a Bill, and I do not suppose that that custom will be departed from on the present occasion. Again, it has been the rule that the discussion on the introduction of a Bill should be very short and the speeches very few. I do not for one moment deprecate the number or the length of the speeches which have been delivered on this subject to-day. On the contrary, I think they will prove of great assistance to those who are responsible for the administration of education in the country, and will enable them to judge the spirit that pervaded your Lordships' House on the First Reading of this Bill. Neither do I regret the introduction of the Bill, for which, as the right rev. Prelate has himself explained, he alone is responsible. A fortnight ago, speaking at Carnarvon, I laid great stress on the opinion of His Majesty's Government with regard to the administration and the working of the present Education Act. I then said that it must not be supposed that the Government desired to force unwelcome procedure or unpalatable legislation down the throat of anyone. I proceeded to say—

> "They (the Government) did not assert that the Act of 1902 was perfect. No Act could be a perfect one—certainly no Education Act—and no Act built on the Act of 1870 could be a perfect settlement of educational difficulties. The Government realised that if, in spite of the compromise they had endeavoured to embody in the Act, difficulties still arose in its working, it might be necessary that further changes should be devised. They were only too anxious to secure any solution of this difficult question which would be accepted permanently by all sections of the community."

After those remarks I could not disapprove of the action of the right rev. Prelate in introducing a Bill which, whatever may be thought of its details, gives practical proof of his desire to take advantage of the opinion of the Government which I put forward on that occasion. I think it shows his ardent desire to promote efficiency of education all over the country, and his equally anxious desire to arrive at some solution of the difficult problem which is retarding the education of the country. I confess that I share with the right rev. Primate regret that the noble Earl, the Leader of the Opposition, should have stated at this early stage of the Bill that he intends to oppose certain of its provisions. So far as I gather from the speech of the right rev. Prelate, the Bill desires to do injustice to none; it is a desire to effect a compromise between all sections, such as I indicated in my speech at Carnarvon. Whether the proposals contained in the Bill are of a practical nature or not it is impossible at the present moment to decide. I do not pledge the Government either to approval or disapproval of the Bill, I would ask the right rev. Prelate to give a reasonable time for the full consideration of the matter and for the question to be thoroughly ventilated. If the right rev. Prelate will do this, I trust I shall be able when the Bill comes before your Lordships for the Second Reading to give him a longer and fuller reply. In the meantime, His Majesty's Government will give every possible consideration to the details of the Bill, and the right rev. Prelate may rely that when the next stage is taken, he will receive from this Bench a full and clear exposition of the views the Government hold with regard to his Bill.

On Question, Bill read 1^a; and to be printed. (No. 72.)

MERCHANT SHIPPING BILL [H.L.].

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

LORD WOLVERTON: My Lords, the Bill which I am about to ask your Lordships to read a second time to-day has been framed to give effect to the recommendations of the Committee appointed by my right hon. friend, the President of the Board of Trade, in 1902. The reference to the Committee was to inquire into and report upon the following matters—

> "(1) The causes that have led to the employment of a large and increasing proportion of Lascars and foreigners in the British merchant service, and the effect of such employment upon the reserve of seamen of British nationality available for naval purposes in time of peace or war.
>
> "(2) The sufficiency or otherwise of the existing law and practice for securing proper

food, accommodation, medical attention, and reasonable conditions of comfort and well-being for seamen on British merchant-ships.

"(3) The prevalence of desertion and other offences against discipline in the mercantile marine.

"And to make such recommendations with respect to these matters as they may think fit."

The Chairman of the Committee was Sir Francis Jeune, and he had associated with him Mr. W. F. G. Anderson, Chairman of the Anchor Line and President of the Chamber of Shipping; Captain H. Acton-Blake, Elder Brother of Trinity House; Mr. Thomas Burt, M.P., late Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade; Captain A. J. G. Chalmers, of the Board of Trade; Colonel John M. Denny, M.P., ship builder, of Dumbarton; Mr. Walter J. Howell, of the Board of Trade; Vice-Admiral R. M. Lloyd, C.B.; Mr. W. Milburn, junior, and Mr. J. Havelock Wilson, head of the Seamen's Union.

The recommendations of this Committee have been formulated in the Bill now before your Lordships. I think your Lordships will recognise from the few figures which I shall quote to the House that my right hon. friend had good reason for appointing this important Committee. The total number of persons employed in the British mercantile marine in 1902 was 253,540. Of these, 174,538 were British, 39,825 foreigners, and 39,177 Lascars and other Asiatics. This represented a percentage of 68·84 British, 15·70 foreigners, and 15·45 Lascars and other Asiatics. The Committee came to the conclusion that there had been a distinct decrease in the number of British seamen employed in the British mercantile marine, and the recommendations which they made had in view the attraction back to the mercantile marine of British seamen, so as to largely reduce the proportion of foreigners. I have heard it said that the legislation proposed is grandmotherly legislation, but if grandmotherly legislation is represented by an attempt to promote the greater happiness and comfort of the merchant service, I am very glad to introduce the measure as such. Clause 1 of the Bill provides that every British foreign-going ship of 1,000 tons gross leaving a port in the United Kingdom will be required to have on board a competent cook, in the same way as such a vessel is compelled to have on board properly certificated officers. A certificate of competency may be granted by any approved school of cookery in this country. The rights of men now serving at sea as cooks are safeguarded by the recognition of certificates of discharge as cook for two years previous to 31st December, 1907, as equivalent to certificates of competency. It came out clearly in the evidence before the Committee that the food was good enough but was spoilt by bad cooking. This clause, I venture to believe, will rectify this state of affairs as far as it is possible to do so.

Clause 2 of the Bill is also concerned with the food of our mercantile marine, and it provides for the inspection of the provisions of any British foreign-going ship the duration of whose voyage is likely to exceed twenty-one days. It may be said that this is a drastic clause, but I would call the attention of the House to the fact that its application will not be general. Under it the Board of Trade are given power, if they choose, to inspect the provisions of such vessels where occasion may require, and I do not think such a provision would inflict any serious inconvenience on the mercantile marine, but would, on the contrary, prove of great advantage. Clause 3 practically explains itself. It demands what I think is quite necessary, namely, an elementary knowledge of the English language on the part of seamen. That will be interpreted, of course, very generally. A superintendent will find out before he ships a man that he understands the simplest possible orders that may be given him—that he fully appreciates the meaning of such words as "port your helm," "starboard your helm," "go astern," and so on. Clause 4 will, I think, obtain general approval. It provides that where it is shown to the satisfaction of the superintendent that a seaman lawfully engaged has wilfully failed to join his ship, the superintendent shall report the matter to the Board of Trade, and that Board may direct that any of his certificates of discharge shall be withheld for such period as they may think fit, the object being to check the large number of desertions and refusals to join. The scale of the provisions set out in the schedule of the Report of the Departmental Committee has been adopted by the Board of Trade, and is recommended to all shipowners. I beg to move the Second Reading of the Bill.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2a."—(*Lord Wolverton.*)

LORD MUSKERRY: My Lords, in making some comments upon this Bill and its Memorandum I recall a charge made against me by my noble friend representing the Board of Trade in this House when last session I myself introduced a Bill with a Memorandum to your Lordships' notice. I was accused of making inaccurate statements, and it is not a matter for surprise that on such authority your Lordships should have been influenced by it. Further inquiries have borne out my impression at the time that mine were the facts and the Board of Trade's the fallacies. Apart from inaccuracies, there are such things as "half-truths," and I would venture to call your Lordships' attention to the remarks in the Memorandum pertaining to Clause 1 of this Bill, viz.—

"If the Bill becomes law, every British foreign-going ship of 1,000 tons gross leaving a port in the United Kingdom will be required to have on board a competent cook in the same way as such a vessel is compelled to have on board properly certificated officers."

Your Lordships would imagine from this that all was well in the direction of British ships being properly manned by certificated officers. You are not told of the defective nature of the law in this respect whereby large vessels under the British flag go careering over the sea, carrying perhaps passengers and mails, without a certificated officer on board. You are not told of the lamentable disasters which have occurred in consequence. You are not informed of the recommendations, urging immediate legislation, by the Manning Commission, who commented so forcibly on the dangers of uncertificated and incompetent officers, and the fact of there being so many unseaworthy British vessels in consequence. No! in the eyes of the Marine Department of the Board of Trade a ship's cook should be certificated, whilst those who actually navigate our ships may be uncertificated and irresponsible, a common danger to themselves and to the ships upon which some of your Lordships might be passengers. When we know that, under Section 92 of the Merchant Shipping Act, the "Oceanic" or the "Campania" could put to sea with simply a certificated master and one certificated officer, we cannot accept the wording of the Memorandum as at least the whole truth of the matter.

This new Board of Trade Bill is an offspring of the celebrated Mercantile Marine Committee, the constitution of which I commented upon in this House. This Committee was undoubtedly constituted in a defective and unrepresentative manner, and was certainly not fitted for its purpose. It is proper to inform your Lordships that, owing to this, the Merchant Service Guild—the largest and most influential organisation of its kind in the world—when invited, declined to have anything to do with the proceedings of the Committee. Owing, I presume, to the fact of two of the staff of the Marine Department of the Board of Trade being members of the Mercantile Marine Committee, surprising and remarkable promptitude has been shown in carrying out its recommendations. We may well ask why the same energy was not shown in regard to the really urgent and important recommendations of the Royal Commission on Unseaworthy Ships, the Manning Committee, the Subsidies Committee, and the Light Load-line Committee, which have involved great labour on the part of public men and much expenditure out of the national purse. For all the good the Marine Department of the Board of Trade have done with them, the Reports of these Committees might as well have been put in the fire. Most of the recommendations of the Mercantile Marine Committee have already been carried into effect without legislation. One, at least, has met with a storm of protest and is likely to cause very serious mischief. I will, however, confine myself to the Bill.

With regard to Section No. 3 of Clause 1, I cannot see the need of the cook being a seafaring man. As to Section 5 of the same clause, I may say that the Marine Department of the Board of Trade do not appear to have the courage of their convictions, and ask your Lordships to sanction legislation to which they may or may not conform, as they please. Whether such legislation is in accord with the traditions of this House I leave for your Lordships to judge. Shipowners having become alarmed at the chance of a "corner in ships' cooks," the Marine Department of the Board of Trade are holding out the olive-branch in this extraordinary way. Section 6 institutes another penalty to which the unfortunate shipmaster may be liable. The total amount of the several penalties which may now be inflicted upon him under the Merchant Shipping Act is something over £7,000, whilst the amount of protection he receives under the Act is practically *nil*. He gets all the kicks and none of the ha'pence. If ships' cooks are to be officially certificated on the same lines as certificated officers, which is the Memorandum's somewhat unhappy way of putting it, it is highly necessary and perfectly proper that there should be some official control over them. It is absurd to suppose that they should be certificated by a Government Department, and then be able to set that authority at defiance. Misconduct, incompetency, or negligence on the part of a ship's cook should most assuredly render him liable to the suspension or cancellation of his certificate. The absence of this power in the Bill is a serious omission on the part of the Marine Department of the Board of Trade, and I propose when the Bill reaches the Committee stage to move an amending clause to supply that omission.

The remainder of the clauses contain nothing of material value; relating simply to extension of powers in inspecting ships' provisions, a knowledge of English on the part of foreign seamen, and the withholding of the discharge of a seaman who wilfully fails to join his vessel. It will, indeed, be a humorous situation when the superintendents of mercantile marine offices must perforce examine each of the multitude of foreigners signing articles in British ships in their knowledge of the English language; and especially so when the superintendent himself may be quite devoid of any knowledge of nautical idioms and terms. The power to withhold a seaman's discharge will be of no avail, for it must be proved that the seaman wilfully neglected to join his vessel. Seamen, as well as other people, can always make specious excuses, and the clause is practically valueless, especially as seamen can always resort to the "pier-head jump." The Bill, as a whole, is one of the weakest things Parliament was ever asked to sanction. I only wish the Marine Department of the Board of Trade would devote their time and trouble to something which would be of some real advantage to ships and seamen.

LORD INVERCLYDE: My Lords, I was glad to hear from the speech of the noble Lord who moved the Second Reading of this Bill that he considers the measure one of importance. I agree that although the Bill does not appear to contain any serious provisions, it is in principle a measure involving matters of considerable importance. The Committee which sat in 1902, and of whose deliberations this Bill is the outcome, was a very strong Committee, and one which represented all classes of the shipping community. The shipowners were represented on it and also the seamen, and the result of the labours of that Committee is this Bill. It is not usual to find so much promptitude exercised in the introduction of legislation, and it is felt by most people connected with the shipping trade that it would have been a good thing if many of the recommendations made by other Committees had with equal promptitude been brought before Parliament in a Departmental Bill. It seems to me that the matters dealt with by this Bill are worthy of careful consideration, and although it is no doubt possible that the clauses of the Bill may be improved in Committee, I trust it will pass into law. At the present time the shipping trade of this country has to face very great competition. It is not very long ago that the noble Lord who represents the Board of Trade stated that it was not the desire of His Majesty's Government that anything should be done which would handicap British shipowners in competing with their foreign rivals. I was very glad to hear that statement. All that we ask with regard to shipping legislation is that whatever regulations are applied to British ships should be applied also to foreign ships coming into our ports. It has been pointed out over and over again that there are harassing restrictions applied to British ships which are not applied to foreign ships using our ports, and we feel that something should be done, not only to bring shipping legislation more up to date, but to enable British shipowners to compete with shipowners of foreign countries on exactly equal terms. British shipowners are not in the least afraid of meeting any competition that may come from any part of the world, but what we say is, that any regulation which is considered good for British ships, should be considered as equally good for foreign ships that come into out ports. There are a few Amendments to this Bill which we shall propose when the measure is in Committee, but they will not be brought forward in any spirit of hostility to the Bill, but rather in the hope that it may be rendered more effective in its working. I would therefore ask my noble friend in charge of the Bill to allow a sufficient interval to elapse between the Second Reading and the Committee stage to enable us to bring forward Amendments.

*LORD ELLENBOROUGH: My Lords, having spent the earlier portion of my life at sea, I am glad to find that something is to be done towards improving the health and comfort of the long-voyage seaman. Hitherto in our worst-found merchant ships, if a man was too timid to go aloft, too feeble or too lazy to work on deck, it was always considered that nature had intended him to be a cook. I think that your Lordships would prefer that I should leave the results to their imagination, instead of attempting to describe them. I look upon the Bill as a very good one as far as it goes, but I think that it might go still further in three directions—as regards cooks, foreigners, and provisioning—without injury to the real interests of shipowners. In the first place, as regards cooks, according to the Memorandum which accompanies the Bill, it has been framed to give effect to the recommendations of a Departmental Committee of the Board of Trade, which was appointed in 1902. The Bill does not come into force until 1908. Six years is a long time for the seaman to wait until Parliament and the Board of Trade have made up their minds as to how he is to be fed, and I think that some of the clauses of the Bill might be brought into operation at an earlier period.

The Memorandum says that the rights of men serving now as cooks are safeguarded by the recognition of certificates of two years service as cooks as equivalent to certificates of competency. The clause referred to safeguards rights that are not yet in existence, for it gives a man three years and a half in which to serve the two years qualifying service which is to relieve him from the necessity of passing the examination required by the Bill. I think that this part of the Bill might very well come into operation a year sooner—that is, on 1st January, 1907. Secondly, as regards foreigners, Clause 3, which requires an alien to know something of the English language, is an excellent one. But why should a man who is not a British subject, and who is still in his own country, be given three and a half years in which to learn enough of that language to make him safe to go to sea with? It is safeguarding rights which do not yet exist, protecting the interests of aliens who have not yet reached our shores, and who I hope will be excluded from our harbours by the operation of the Aliens Bill which is being discussed in another place. This part of the Act might very well come into operation on 1st January, 1906. If the Board of Trade has not already got the power, a section might be added to this clause giving the Board authority to issue regulations as to the minimum amount of English required, so that the standard should not differ too much in various ports. A foreign seaman should, I think, know enough English to be able to take the helm, lead, and lookout, without endangering his shipmates. In sailing ships, it is a question whether the qualifications should not be considerably higher.

Thirdly, as regards provisioning, as there is to be an inspection as to the quality of provisions, it would cause very little additional trouble if such inspection included quantity also, as is done in the case of emigrants, under Clauses 298 and 299 of the Merchant Shipping Act of 1894. A very good scale of provisioning is to be found in the Appendix of a Report dated 7th May, 1903, which was presented to both Houses of Parliament. In Section 9, page 11, of this Report, the Committee recommend the universal adoption of this scale on board all British ships. This Report is signed by a very strong Committee. I think that the Board of Trade should have in the background the power of compelling ships in certain cases to adopt the scale I have referred to. I should not think of suggesting compulsion, if it were not for the exemption sections contained in Clause 299 of the Merchant Shipping Act of 1894, which I think can in this case be still further widened by giving the Board of Trade power to grant exemptions for one year, or a lesser period, to all vessels owned by certain companies and by well-known shipowners, as well as to single ships. To prevent abuse of these exemptions the Board should have power to refuse to renew them, if complaints were substantiated on inquiry. If shipowners could be brought to understand the immense width of these exemption clauses, I do not think that the majority of them would object to the alterations in the Bill that I suggest.

When a horse is hard-worked, every ounce of oats that he eats, benefits the owner as well as the horse. This analogy holds good as regards the shipowners and the merchant seaman. Most shipowners are aware of this, and act accordingly. Lime juice will keep off scurvy, but men on board ship are constantly meeting with small accidents. Slight injuries in which the skin is broken would heal more rapidly under the influence of the substitutes for vegetables which are contained in the scale I have referred to. Any expenses incurred by the owners would be recouped by the increased healthiness of the crew. A sick list is a very expensive article. In addition to the expense, it has been objected that the additional weight of the improved ration would lessen the capacity of the ship for carrying cargo. An extra 1lb. for twenty men for 112 days, would only amount to a ton, and this Bill does not affect vessels of less than 1,000 tons. The additional expense which the Government has lately incurred in improving the rations issued to the Royal Navy, has been calculated at about five farthings per man per diem, which is a trifle compared with the wages which are paid in the merchant service. In conclusion, I would ask the noble Lord in charge of the Bill not to commit himself by refusing to consider my suggestions at the present stage of the Bill, but to leave it open until the House is in Committee, by which time he will have had leisure to consider them in consultation with others. The Bill is a very good one so far as it goes, but it is capable of still further improvement without ultimately causing any additional expense to shipowners.

LORD BRASSEY: My Lords, I congratulate the Government on the introduction of a measure which, though of limited scope, deals with real evils. Great misery is endured on board ship from incompetent cooks. Some of your Lordships have read "Round the Horn before the Mast"—the book recently published by Mr. Basil Lubbock. It recalls Dana's well-known "Two Years before the Mast." Mr. Lubbock describes hard struggles with fierce gales; but the miseries of the voyage were chiefly from bad food, consisting of rocky loaves and some awful stuff misnamed "pea-soup." We can understand the joy of the crew when "Old Slush," the incapable cook, was disrated and ordered forward. Other provisions in the Bill, such as that requiring an adequate knowledge of the English language, are in conformity with the recommendations of the most recent Committee on manning. The Bill, in short, is good so far as it goes. It does not go very far. Nor is it possible to deal by legislation with the conditions under which the manning of our mercantile marine is gradually passing more and more from men of our race into the hands of foreigners. In 1860—at the date of the Report of the Royal Commission, to whose recommendations we owe the Royal Naval Reserve—foreigners were 8·05 per cent. of the total number employed. The proportion has increased to 21·14 per cent.; and, as the Registrar-General pointed out to Sir Francis Jeune's Committee, the decrease in the number of British seamen and firemen is most marked in the later years. The causes are not far to seek. For deck duties in steam vessels few qualified seamen are required. In the stokehold—and especially in the tropics—the work is not attractive, and there are other causes at work for which the men are responsible. The evidence of Mr. Anderson, whose firm are managers of the well-known Orient-Pacific line, as given before Sir Francis Jeune's Committee, fully explains the changes which are taking place—

> "The white firemen tried to make bargains with the commanders of the ships at sea, as to what speed they were to maintain. They had disgraceful scenes. They had to take men on board by force, handcuffed. They could not go on with it any longer. They decided to carry Lascars."

Of the qualifications of the Lascars, especially for work as firemen in hot climates, the Committee reported in the highest terms. They said—

> "They are temperate, and those who came before us made a most favourable impression. The evidence shows that they make most amenable and contented crews."

On some great trade routes white men, and chiefly British subjects, continue to be employed. In steamships in the coasting trade the percentage of foreigners falls to 3·7 per cent. High pay attracts good men. In the coasting trade in America and Australia, wages for firemen rise to £10 a month. From Liverpool, in the fast mail boats, the wages for firemen are £5 a month with provisions. There are no foreigners in these well-paid trades. We cannot fix wages by legislation. There is only one thing that the Government can do, and that it should do. The numbers of our Naval Reserve should be largely increased and thoroughly trained. We should have on our muster-rolls, as the French have, not less than 100,000 men. The retainers and the pay when under retaining would supplement the wages which shipowners, under the pressure of severe competition, are able to give. Such a policy would make our sea service more attractive. The cost could be covered by arresting the growth, and by gradually reducing the numbers, of the permanent force of the Navy to not exceeding 100,000 men. By the policy which I am endeavouring to urge our resources for manning the Navy in an emergency may be increased, our expenditure in time of peace may be cut down, and the discredit which is coming upon us as a nation, as the owners of a vast tonnage manned by foreigners, may be removed.

On Question, Bill read 2^a accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

Lord WOLVERTON: I may inform the House that I do not propose to take the Committee stage until after the Whitsuntide recess.

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION BILL [H.L.].

House in Committee (according to order.)

The LORD CHANCELLOR (The Earl of Halsbury): My Lords, when this Bill is before the Standing Committee I shall endeavour to meet some of the objections which were raised to it on the Second Reading by the noble and learned Lord behind me.

Bill reported without Amendment, and recommitted to the Standing Committee.

PRIZE COURTS BILL [H.L.].

[Second Reading.]

Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

The LORD CHANCELLOR (The Earl of Halsbury): My Lords, this Bill proposes a small amendment in the law. Persons who administer oaths are appointed as persons who can properly administer oaths, but the appointment under the statute by which that matter is governed must be of persons who are to administer oaths in respect of proceedings in the High Court of Justice. Prize Courts are not included within that description. The result is that no such persons can be appointed for the purpose of a Prize Court. The object of this Bill is so to amend the law that captains and other persons on board any of His Majesty's ships should be empowered to administer oaths when proceedings are intended to be taken in a Prize Court.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a." (*The Lord Chancellor.*)

On Question, Bill read 2^a, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Friday next.

BILLS OF EXCHANGE ACT, 1882, AMENDMENT BILL [H.L.].

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (The Earl of HALSBURY): My Lords, this is the same Bill that I introduced to your Lordships' House last session. The object of the Bill is to give a wider interpretation to a section in the Act of 1882, and to give bankers that protection which I think the authors of the Act intended to give them. It has been suggested, and the Court of Appeal has given effect to the suggestion, that a banker who carries a bill of exchange to a customer's account before the date on which the bill becomes due is, in fact, lending to his customer, and, therefore, is not protected by the Act of 1882. That was not the intention of the authors, and this Bill is intended to give bankers protection in such cases.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2a."—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

On Question, Bill read 2a, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Friday next.

House adjourned at half-past Six o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 9th May, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).

MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz.:—Chesterfield Gas and Water Board Bill [Lords]; Harrogate Waterworks Tramroad Bill [Lords]; Leeds Corporation (Waterworks) Railway Bill [Lords]; Maidenhead Bridge Bill [Lords]; Neath, Pontardawe, and Brynaman Railway Bill [Lords]; South Staffordshire Mines Drainage Bill [Lords]. Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS (NO STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE).

MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, referred on the First Reading thereof, no Standing Orders are applicable, viz.:—Commons Regulation (Merrow) Provisional Order Bill; Commons Regulation (Oxshott) Provisional Order Bill. Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time To-morrow.

Plymouth Corporation Bill. As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

Barnard Castle Gas Bill [Lords]; Lancashire Electric Power Bill [Lords]. Read a second time, and committed.

Thames River Steamboat Service Bill (by Order). Consideration, as amended, deferred till Thursday.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No 3) Bill. Read the third time, and passed.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill. As amended, considered; to be read the third time To-morrow.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—Sutton Gas Bill; Bishop's Stortford and District Gas Bill, without Amendment.

Kettering Improvement Bill, with Amendments.

PETITIONS.

LICENCES (RENEWAL).

Petitions against alteration of Law; from London; Leicester; Plymouth; Leicestershire; Shipley; Seghill (two);

Stratford; Cheltenham; Swindon; Highworth; Battersea; New Delaval; Scholes; Wigan; East and Mid Surrey; Whitchurch; Alverstoke; Wincanton; Hanley; Throckley; Guildford; North Durham; Pilsby; Whitchurch; Newnham on Severn; Reading; Newcastle Emlyn; Great Yarmouth; Sparkbrook; and Bristol (two); to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions against; from Luton; Merthyr Tydfil; Wakefield; Leicester (three); Mountain Ash: Awsworth; Paisley; Charles Forknall; Newark; Stonebroom; Belfast; Leamington; Willington Quay; Aston; Gateshead (eleven); Bloxworth; Greenock (twelve); Newburn; Seaton Burn; Gosforth; Poole (six); Market Harborough; Naseby; Morden; Lower Lytchett; Waterloo; United Kingdom Alliance; Street; Guildford; Dundee (two); Wood Green; Harrogate; Knaresborough; Inverness; Battersea (three); St. Cleares; East Ham; Hebburn Colliery; Willenhall; King's Lynn; Peterborough; Wishaw; Craigcuk; Durham; Trafalgar Square; Upton; Wigton; Great Harwood; Clapham; Lavender Hill; New Delaval; Willington; Pembroke Dock; Bradford (four); Southend-on-Sea (two); Coseley; Tunstall; Birmingham; Dunstable; Langdon Hills; Roden; Bristol; Deptford; Nantwich; Rotherhithe; Brxton Hill; Camberwell; Whitehaven; and Small Heath; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.

Petition from Idle, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION BILL.

Petition from Bristol, against; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

RAILWAY AND CANAL TRAFFIC ACTS, 1854 TO 1894.

Copy presented, of Fifteenth Annual Report of the Railway and Canal Commission, with Appendix [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

POLLING DISTRICTS (COUNTY OF MIDDLESEX).

Copy presented, of Orders made by the County Council of the county of Middlesex altering certain Polling Districts in the Tottenham Parliamentary Division [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) (CONTINUATION CLASSES).

Copy presented, of Reports, Statistics, etc., on Continuation Classes (Scotland), 1902–3 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

CROFTERS' HOLDINGS (SCOTLAND) ACTS.

Copy presented, of Report of the Crofters' Commission for the year 1903 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

UNIVERSITY OF ST. ANDREW'S.

Copy presented, of Abstract of Accounts of the University for the year ended 30th September, 1903 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 162.]

UNIVERSITY OF ST. ANDREW'S.

Copy presented, of Annual Statistical Report by the University Court of the University of St. Andrew's for the year 1902–3 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 163.]

BOARD OF EDUCATION (CODE, 1904).

Copy presented, of Code of Regulations for Public Elementary Schools, with Schedules, by the Board of Education [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3153 to 3156 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PAPERS LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

Lunacy. Copy of Report to the Lord Chancellor of the number of visits made, the number of Patients seen, and the

The average prices of British wheat, barley, and oats, as published in the London Gazette, for each of the years 1849–1853 and 1899–1903, inclusive, were as follows :—

Year.	Average Price per Imperial Quarter		
	Wheat.	Barley.	Oats.
	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.
1849	44 3	27 9	17 6
1850	40 3	23 5	16 5
1851	38 6	24 9	18 7
1852	40 9	28 6	19 1
1853	53 3	33 2	21 0
1899	25 8	25 7	17 0
1900	26 11	24 11	17 7
1901	26 9	25 2	18 5
1902	28 1	25 8	20 2
1903	26 9	22 8	17 2

These prices relate to England and Wales. There are no official returns of the price of corn in Scotland, and for information relating to Ireland reference might be made to the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction for Ireland. No official statistics of acreage and production exist for Great Britain for the years 1849–53. In 1854, however, an estimate of the acreage under crops, based upon inquiries conducted in eleven counties, was made by the Poor Law Board for England and Wales. This estimate was as follows :—Wheat, 3,807,846 acres; barley, 2,667,776 acres; all corn (wheat, barley, oats, beans, and peas), 8,476,592 acres. No estimates of produce were made For Scotland, for the same year, statistics were also collected by the Highland and Agricultural Society, who presented a Report to the Board of Trade. The following figures were given as the area and production in Scotland in 1854 :—

	Area.	Production.
	Acres.	Bushels.
Wheat . . .	168,216	4,848,499
Barley . . .	207,507	7,639,601
All Corn (Wheat, Barley, Oats, Bere, Beans, and Peas) .	1,370,706¼	47 960,590*

* Exclusive of the Produce of Peas.

An unofficial estimate for the year 1853, by Lawes and Gilbert, placed the acreage under wheat in the United Kingdom at 4,058,731 acres, and the production of that cereal at 11,574,982 quarters.

Postage in England of Lottery Circulars.

Sir THOMAS DEWAR (Tower Hamlets, St. George's): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is aware that circular letters associated with lottery drawings, conducted at the Fritz Dorge Bank, 16, Zoltan Street, Budapest, were on the 23rd April last posted in London to persons in the United Kingdom; and, having regard to the effect of such circulars, will he instruct His Majesty's Consul-General at Budapest to institute some inquiry with a view to ascertain the name and address of the agent in this country by whom these operations are conducted.

(*Answered by Earl Percy.*) We are informed that some complaints have been made to the General Post Office on the subject of the receipt of letters of this nature, and the question whether inquiries can be usefully made in the direction indicated is under consideration.

Recommendations of Mercantile Marine Committee.

Mr. LODER (Brighton): To ask the President of the Board of Trade what steps he has taken, or proposes to take, to carry out the recommendations of the Committee appointed last year to inquire into certain questions affecting the mercantile marine.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) A Bill to give effect to the first four recommendations of the Committee to which my hon. friend refers has been introduced in another place. The Bill proposes to require sea cooks to be certificated in certain cases, to extend the present system of inspection of ship's provisions, to ensure some knowledge of the English language on the part of seamen engaged in the United Kingdom, and to provide a deterrent for the offence of failure to join a vessel after signing articles. Other recommendations of the Committee shown on page xi. of the Report, Cd. Paper 1607, have been dealt with as follows:—The recommendation in favour of efforts being made to increase the number of merchant seamen who are members of the Royal Naval Reserve has been brought to the notice of the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty. Departmental action has been taken to give to seaman who feel unjustly treated, when they receive an adverse character report on discharge, a right of appeal to the Superintendent of the Mercantile Marine Office where they are paid off. My right hon. friend the Secretary of State for the Home Department has made regulations facilitating the neutralisation of foreign seamen who have served an adequate time (five years, including residence in the United Kingdom) on British ships, provided that they intend to continue to serve or to reside in the United Kingdom. Steps have been taken to facilitate and encourage the adoption of the provision scale recommended by the Committee. This recommendation, together with those in favour of comfortable living quarters for seamen on board ship, and the training of boys with the object of increasing the number of British seamen, has been commended to the leading associations of shipowners. The desirability of officers possessing a knowledge of the elements of medicine and surgery (Recommendation No. 8) was brought to the notice of the chief Associations of Owners and Officers.

Licences withdrawn in Scotland for Causes other than Misconduct.

MR. MUNRO FERGUSON (Leith Burghs): To ask the Secretary for Scotland whether he will grant a Return showing the numbers of licences withdrawn in Scotland for causes other than misconduct in each year since 1880.

(*Answered by Mr. A. Graham Murray.*) Such information as is available on the subject of the number of licences granted and refused in Scotland will be found in the annual volumes of the Judicial Statistics issued since 1897. It does not include particulars as to the grounds of withdrawal; and, as the licensing authorities are not required to state their grounds, it would be impracticable to obtain them with any certainty, and I am not prepared to grant the Return.

Land Purchase Act—Protests of Irish Joint Stock Banks.

MR. WILLIAM MOORE (Antrim, N.): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether his attention has been called to the letters addressed by various of the joint stock banks of Ireland to the Under-Secretary of Ireland protesting against the disabilities under which these banks will be placed by the Land Purchase Act of 1903 as compared with the Bank of Ireland; and whether arrangements could be made so as to ensure a fair distribution amongst all the joint stock banks of Ireland, including the Bank of Ireland, of all the accounts connected with the working of that Act, and, in particular, that the Public Trustee should be authorised to keep the accounts of any estate with any bank he may think fit to select, having due regard to a fair distribution of the business, and that for that purpose the deposit receipts of the joint stock banks of Ireland should be considered authorised securities; and further, that all the joint stock banks of Ireland should be authorised to receive the annuity instalments, collecting them free, and accounting for same periodically to the Treasury, but being permitted to retain same for a period to recoup them for the expense and trouble of collection.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) I am aware that representations have been made by the Irish joint stock banks. It would not be possible to make arrangements for putting the other banks on the same footing as the Bank of Ireland. The Bank of Ireland is the Government Bank in Ireland; its special relations with Government have existed ever since its foundation, and have been recognised and confirmed by numerous Acts of Parliament. To distribute the accounts of the Public Trustee or other accounts under the Land Act in the manner suggested would cause inconvenience and confusion without any compensatory advantage. As regards the instalments of purchase annuities, it has been arranged that they can be paid in through any bank for remittance to the Land Commission Account at the Bank of

Ireland in Dublin. I see no reason for allowing any delay in the remittance of moneys so received; such delay would merely tend to increase the cost of working the provisions of the Land Act.

Sewage Nuisance near Carrickfergus.

COLONEL McCALMONT (Antrim, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a sewage nuisance has been reported to the Local Government Board (Ireland) as having broken out on the Belfast road near Carrickfergus; and, if so, will he state when steps will be taken to remedy it.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) A complaint of this nature has been made to the Local Government Board, and in a communication received from the district council it is stated that the council is making every effort to have the necessary drainage scheme carried out at an early date.

Irish Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction.

MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will state the total amount of funds which the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction has disbursed (including all contributions from local rates and Government sources) from its inception up to the 31st March last, and the proportion of same which has gone in salaries and emoluments to officials.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The information will be found in the published annual Reports of the Department, which have been brought down to the 31st March, 1903. It is not yet available in respect of the financial year ended 31st March last.

Estate at Mount Shannon.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a farm of 235 acres at Mount Shannon, the property of Mr. Marcus Keane, D.L., is advertised for sale on 10th May, and that there are on the adjoining estate a number of tenants whose applications to the Commissioners to purchase their holdings have been refused on the grounds that their holdings are not sufficient security for an advance; and whether he will direct the Estates Commissioners to consider the advisability of securing this farm with a view to the enlargement of these holdings.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) There is some difficulty in identifying the estate to which reference is made. Perhaps the hon. Member will communicate to me the name of the owner and of the locality in which it is situated; further inquiry will then be made.

Retired Volunteer Sergeants—Uniform.

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY (Yorkshire, Shipley): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether, under the regulations governing the Volunteer force, a sergeant of at least ten years standing may, with the consent of the officer commanding the district, and upon the recommendation of the commanding officer of the regiment, have permission to wear the uniform of his rank after retirement; whether under such permission, a sergeant in retirement receives his uniform from the depôt of his former regiment; and whether, as it wears out, he has to purchase any renewals of the same at his own cost.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) Under the Volunteer Regulations a sergeant after ten years service in the rank who is specially recommended by his commanding officer may, under the authority of the officer commanding the regimental district, be permitted to retain his rank and to wear the sergeant's uniform of his corps with the letter R on the shoulder straps. Volunteer uniform is provided and issued regimentally. It is purchased from the capitation grant and distributed under corps rules. A retired Volunteer earns no capitation grant, and has therefore no claim to a renewal of uniform.

Conveyance of Military Passengers from Clonmany to Leenan Fort, County Donegal.

Mr. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): To ask the Secretary of State for War if his attention has been called to the fact that the conveyance of military passengers by car between Clonmany railway station and the fort at Leenan, county Donegal, is performed by a car owner resident in Buncrana, fifteen miles from the Leenan Fort, although there are car owners in the town of Clonmany competent to perform the service of conveyance of such passengers; if so, will he state if the work has been offered for contract by tender, and have applications been received by the War Department and by the district office in Belfast from car owners of Clonmany for the work, in view of the custom of the War Department to get such work done by local men when they are competent to perform it; what is the present contract price for single and double journey to Leenan; if any of the tenders for the work were less than the sums being paid at the present time; and if this contract was carried out under the rules of the War Department.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) The hon. Member has been somewhat misinformed. There is not, and never has been, any contract for the conveyance of military passengers between Clonmany and Leenan Head Fort. In January, 1902, the General Officer Commanding Belfast District made inquiries among the local car drivers to ascertain what the proper fare should be, in order that officers might know what figure they should insert in their claims for repayment by the War Office. As the result of this inquiry the rate of 7d. a mile (including the return journey and allowing three hours detention) was notified in district orders for the information of officers, as the amount which they could recover in travelling claims.

Commission of Crown Agents on Goods purchased for South Africa.

Sir HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies what is the amount paid in commission to the Crown Agents for goods purchased by them for South Africa during the last four years.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*) I have been furnished with the following statement:—

	Stores.			Commission.		
South Africa.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
1900.						
Transvaal . . .	6	9	8		1	3
1901.						
Transvaal . . .	25,039	0	0	250	7	8
South African Constabulary . .	27,550	0	0	275	10	1
Orange River Colony . . .	2,788	0	0	27	17	7
	55,377	0	0	553	15	4
1902.						
Transvaal . . .	136,785	0	0	1,367	16	11
South African Constabulary . .	53,549	0	0	535	9	11
Central South African Railways	131,096	0	0	1,310	19	1
Concentration Camps . . .	35,796	0	0	357	19	1
Orange River Colony . . .	6,715	0	0	67	2	10
	363,941	0	0	3,639	7	10
1903.						
Transvaal . . .	237,322	0	0	2,373	3	2
South African Constabulary . .	62,830	0	0	628	5	7
Central South African Railways	1,588,594	0	0	15,885	17	4
Orange River Colony . . .	22,116	0	0	221	2	10
	1,910,862	0	0	19,108	8	11

	Stores.			Commission		
Recapitulation.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
1900	6	0	0		1	3
1901	55,377	0	0	553	15	4
1902	363,941	0	0	3,639	7	10
1903	1,910,862	0	0	19,108	8	11
	2,330,186	0	0	23,301	13	4

give the Return of contract price of brushes imported into Ireland for Army purposes for a similar period.

Mr. BROMLEY DAVENPORT: As the hon. Member has been informed on a previous occasion, the Ordnance Workshops at Dublin, as at other stations, are only used for the repair of stores, and manufacture is not permitted.

Mr. NANNETTI: Will the hon. Gentleman give the Return I ask for?

Mr. BROMLEY DAVENPORT: No, Sir; I do not think the information would be worth the labour involved.

Mr. NANNETTI: I want it for the information of the people of Ireland. Will the hon. Gentleman not give it for that purpose?

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! The Question has already been answered.

Mr. NANNETTI: I will put another Question down.

Royal Commission on the Militia and Volunteers.

Captain NORTON (Newington, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, seeing that the Royal Commission on Militia and Volunteers was appointed with a view to the cooperation of those forces in connection with the military system in existence at the time of its appointment, he will say whether the Commission is to report, taking into consideration the conditions existing under the old system, or has been directed to base its Report upon the altered circumstances brought about by the rejection of the old system.

Mr. BROMLEY DAVENPORT: No alteration has been made in the terms of reference of the Royal Commission on the Militia and Volunteers. I do not know what the character of the Report is likely to be, nor whether it is likely to be affected in any way by the recent changes in the organisation of the War Office. I see no reason why it should be so affected.

Foot Guards Officers' Overcoats.

Sir CARNE RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the officers of the Foot Guards have been ordered to provide themselves with a new great coat of French grey lined with red; and will he state what was the date of the last change in officers' uniform.

Mr. BROMLEY DAVENPORT: The officers of the Foot Guards have been directed to provide themselves with a new great coat of Atholl grey by 1st June. The last changes in the uniform of Guards' officers were made in February, 1902.

Transvaal Labour Ordinance--Plague at Hong-Kong.

Mr. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he has received any official information to the effect that the charter for the steamer to convey Chinese coolies to South Africa has been cancelled owing to the prevalence of plague at Hong-Kong; will he state whether Chinese coolies awaiting shipment at Hong-Kong are quartered in Chinese houses, or have arrangements been made for keeping them apart from the infected population; if so, will he state what kind of accommodation is provided, and in what part of Hong-Kong it is situated?

The SECRETARY of STATE for the COLONIES (Mr. Lyttelton, Warwick and Leamington): The answer is in the negative. I am informed by the Officer Administering the Government of Hong-Kong that intending emigrants on arrival at Hong-Kong during last fortnight have been accommodated in ordinary Chinese lodging-houses in Kowloon, of which a number have been hired and placed under special medical inspection, a permanent isolated depôt is being built four miles from Kowloon and isolated temporary accommodation will be ready in two days; all emigrants who satisfy emigration officer and pass strict medical examination will be sent there pending shipment; those rejected being sent home.

Sir WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he has received any information respecting the alleged outbreak of plague among the recruited Chinese labourers now collected at Hong-Kong; whether he is aware that plague usually begins to increase at this period of the year; and whether, under these circumstances, he proposes to take any steps to postpone the introduction of indentured Chinamen into the Transvaal.

MR. LYTTELTON: I received a telegram from the Officer Administering the Government of Hong-Kong on Saturday stating that one case of bubonic plague had occurred in a lodging-house partly occupied by emigrants—the patient was a rejected emigrant; and that there has been no other case among emigrants up to the present time. I believe this is the case. So long as the medical advisers of the local Government do not regard the conditions under which the Chinese labourers are introduced as involving undue risk, and subject to such precautions as they think necessary, I do not, as at present advised, propose to interfere. I may add that the length of the voyage from China is largely in excess of the period of incubation of the disease, and this very greatly reduces the risk of the introduction of plague.

MR. BUCHANAN (Perthshire, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies, whether, owing to the outbreak of plague at Hong-Kong, the charters for the steamers on the point of starting with Chinese indentured labourers for the Transvaal have been cancelled.

MR. LYTTELTON: No, Sir.

Mortality in the South African Mines.

MR. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W. R., Elland): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies how soon he expects to publish the promised Return on the mortality in the South African mines.

MR. LYTTELTON: I telegraphed to Lord Milner inquiring when I may expect the Return, and he informs me that he has not yet received Returns from Rhodesia, but is again communicating with Administrator, and also with Governor, Cape of Good Hope, who were asked to supply information as regards Kimberley direct to me. Lord Milner adds, the Transvaal mines have lately shown very satisfactory decrease in death rate, which was 36 per 1,000 in March, and 32 in April, as compared with 49 and 52 for corresponding months of last year. Lord Milner further adds, that if it had not been for one unfortunate accident involving 43 deaths, as to which he has sent a report by last mail, the death rate during April would have been only 26 per 1,000 per annum. Notwithstanding this accident, however, April rate is lowest yet recorded on mines; is over 50 per cent. below general average for year 1903, and 38 per cent. lower than rate for corresponding month of 1903. I expect to receive Lord Milner's despatch, with Returns, by the end of this month.

Congo Independent State—Case of Silvanus Jones.

*MR. EMMOTT (Oldham): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the attention of His Majesty's Government has been called to the sentence of ten years imprisonment and a fine imposed on Silvanus Jones, a British Colonial subject born in Lagos, by the Court of First Instance at Boma, in the Congo Independent State, on 12th February, 1904, and confirmed by the Appeal Court on 15th March, 1904; whether the prisoner maintained that the crimes he committed were authorised, both by the procedure of his superiors as well as by their direct orders; whether documentary evidence of the issue of such orders by the executive was required by the Court and refused by the local Government of the Congo Independent State; and whether, seeing that the Court itself attributed the acts of which Silvanus Jones was found guilty to the environment in which he found himself, and the example he received from his chief, and that material evidence was withheld, His Majesty's Government propose to take any steps in the matter.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Earl PERCY, Kensington, S.): His Majesty's Government have only just received a full report of the case from the Acting British Consul at Boma, and have it now under consideration.

Alleged Congo Atrocities—Letter from Belgium Consul-General at Liverpool.

*Mr. EMMOTT: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the attention of His Majesty's Government has been called to a letter dated 15th, April, 1904, addressed by M. Sève, Consul-General for Belgium at Liverpool, in which the report of His Majesty's Consul in the Congo Independent State, dated 11th December, 1903, given in the White-book, Africa, No. 1, 1904, is characterised as a libel; and, if so, will he say whether such language employed by a representative of a friendly Government is a breach of international courtesy; and, if so, what steps His Majesty's Government are taking to mark their sense of the impropriety of such action on the part of a foreign official.

Earl PERCY: The attention of His Majesty's Government had not previously been called to the letter referred to, but steps will be taken to bring the matter to the notice of the Belgian Government.

The Capture of Illig.

Mr. WHITE RIDLEY (Stalybridge): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs why the Italian squadron did not participate in the bombardment of Illig and if they have taken any part in the operations against the Mullah.

Earl PERCY: The operations at Illig were carried out in pursuance of a plan agreed upon by the two Governments, the Italian battleship being held in readiness to give assistance if it should be required. The decision of the Italian Government not to place troops in the field during the successive campaigns against the Mullah (a decision which was communicated to His Majesty's Government at the commencement of the operations) does not lessen the value of the service which they have rendered in allowing their territory to be used as a base for military operations which could not otherwise have been carried out at all.

Valuation of Licenced Premises in Scotland.

Mr. BLACK (Banffshire): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, in view of the fact that it is customary in Scotand to value separately the goodwill of licensed premises for estate duty purposes, will he state how many years purchase of net profits is usually accepted in Scotland as a fair valuation of goodwill of such businesses; and what is the average annual amount of licence values on which estate duty has been paid in Scotland during the last three years.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Worcestershire, E.): The practice in Scotland in valuing the goodwill of licensed premises does not differ materially from the practice in England; and there are no statistics available that would enable the Board of Inland Revenue to give an answer to the Questions asked.

The New Florin.

Mr. ELLIS GRIFFITH (Anglesey): I beg to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer if he will state the name of the artist who designed the new florin coin, by whom such artist was selected, and whether after open competition or not; whether his attention has been called to the facts that the horizon slopes from left to right, that the figure of Britannia is so designed that the head and body are not in the proportion usually associated with the best representations of the female form, that there are no indications of a second foot, and that the rim of the coin has no beading to support it; and whether he proposes to withdraw the coin from circulation, and in a subsequent issue to correct these errors.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The design for the new florin was executed by the late Mr. De Saulles, who was appointed Engraver by the Mint in 1894, There was no competition. The post of Engraver to the Mint was abolished on Mr. De Saulles's death. There is no intention at present of making a new design.

Mr. ELLIS GRIFFITH: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman if his attention has been called to the details of the design?

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: My attention has not been called to them otherwise than by the Question, and I purposely refrained from discussing a matter of taste across the floor of the House.

Mr. ELLIS GRIFFITH: Will the right hon. Gentleman answer the last part of my Question?

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Certainly, there is no question of withdrawing the coin. I thought my answer conveyed that.

Licensing Bill—Brewery Shareholders as Licensing Justices.

Sir THOMAS DEWAR (Tower Hamlets, St. George's): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he will insert a clause in the Licensing Bill to provide that proprietors, directors, or shareholders in breweries, shall not be debarred from sitting upon the Licensing Bench when they have no personal interest in the business under discussion.

*The SECRETARY of STATE for the HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. Akers-Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's): I do not contemplate adding any such clause to the Bill. Of course if my hon. friend desires to take the opinion of the House on the point he can put down an Amendment.

Post Office Sorters' Wages Grievance.

Captain NORTON: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, if, seeing the inconvenience to the sorting staff of the Post Office which is caused by the present system of paying salaries, he can see his way to authorising the payment of such salaries fortnightly as petitioned for by that body.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton): I have received memorials from members of the sorting staff asking for the payment of their wages fortnightly and also a memorial asking for payment weekly. There are difficulties in meeting the wishes of the memorialists; but I propose to go more fully into the question before arriving at a final decision.

Railway Rates Inquiry.

Sir EDWARD STRACHEY (Somersetshire, S.): I beg to ask the hon. Member for North Huntingdonshire, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether he will state why no tenant farmers have been placed on the Departmental Committee appointed by the President of the Board of Agriculture to inquire into the rates charged by British railway companies for the carriage of foreign and colonial produce; and whether the President will appoint at least two such representatives of a class who are so much affected by such rates.

Mr. AILWYN FELLOWES (Huntingdonshire, Ramsey): The Committee held its first sitting on Thursday last, and has arranged to invite chambers of agriculture to specify the complaints of members of their several chambers. The adoption of the suggestion made by the hon. Baronet would entail a considerable enlargement of the Committee and disturb the balance of its composition. It is not, therefore, possible for my noble friend, the President of the Board, now to give effect to it. We are, however, very anxious at all times to secure the assistance of tenant farmers in connection with inquiries initiated by the Department, but in this instance the subject-matter is one of considerable technical difficulty, and such assistance can most usefully be given by means of oral and written evidence as to particular rates which appear to call for examination.

Sir EDWARD STRACHEY: But do not farmers possess technical knowledge on this subject quite as much as railway directors?

Mr. AILWYN FELLOWES: Quite so, but my noble friend thinks tenant farmers will do better by giving information to the Committee than by serving on it.

Carriage of Milk by Railway—Locked Churns.

Sir EDWARD STRACHEY: I beg to ask the hon. Member for North Huntingdonshire, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether, seeing that there is still much doubt amongst farmers as to railway companies allowing milk churns to be locked, the Board of Agriculture will circulate a leaflet explaining that all railway companies allow milk churns to be sent by rail either locked or sealed and at the same rate as for unlocked or unsealed milk churns.

Mr. AILWYN FELLOWES: A leaflet on the subject referred to by the hon. Member is in course of preparation.

Land Purchase in Ireland.

Mr. SHEEHY (Meath, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland when a future tenant pays what he considers an exorbitant rent, and also joins in an agreement to purchase his holding, doing both under protest and under pressure of a writ for arrears, and therefore not voluntarily, and the tenant wants the holding to be impartially valued, will the Land Commissioners sanction such a sale and the payment of a bonus to the landlord in respect of it without getting the holding valued.

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Mr. Wyndham, Dover): The holding of a future tenant sold under the Act of 1903 comes within the provisions of Sub-section 2 of Section 1 of that Act under which an advance can only be made if the Commissioners are satisfied with the security and consider that the agreed price is equitable.

Mr. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): Then what remedy has the future tenant if he cannot obtain his land at a fair price?

Mr. WYNDHAM: The position has not worsened since my statement last year.

Courtown Harbour.

Sir THOMAS ESMONDE (Wexford, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will arrange with the Board of Works for the sending of their dredger as speedily as possible to dredge the entrance of Courtown Harbour, county Wexford.

Mr. WYNDHAM: There is not sufficient depth of water at Courtown Harbour to enable the suction dredger to be worked there. The other dredger is not at present available, as it will be required at Howth and Dunmore during the whole of the season.

Irish Police—Mr. Crane's Letter.

Mr. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to a letter in the newspapers last month from Mr. C. P. Crane, resident magistrate for the county of Kerry, dealing with the constitution and reform of the police force in Ireland; and, if so, will he say if it is permissible for a paid servant of the Government to engage in public controversy in such matters.

Mr. WYNDHAM: Resident magistrates are prohibited from addressing communications to the public Press connected with their official duties without obtaining the previous sanction of the Government. Mr. Crane's letter referred to a controversy then being carried on in the newspaper Press in England in reference to the discipline of the English police. It does not, I think, come within the letter of the prohibition.

Garryhinch Estate, Queen's County.

Mr. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the date upon which the Warburton, Garryhinch Estate, Queen's County, was placed in the Land Judge's Court; and whether any, and if so, what steps have been taken for the sale of this property to the tenants.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The petition for sale in the case of this estate was presented to the Land Judge in 1885. The order made by the Judge was for the sale of the life interest only of the owner. In answer to the second part of the Question, I have nothing to add to my reply to the similar Question addressed to me by the hon. Member on the 29th May, 1902.†

Lord Killanin's Property, County Galway.

Mr. ROCHE (Galway, E.): On behalf of the hon. Member for South Galway, I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the seven tenants on Lord Killanin's property in the district of Creggs, Craughwell, county of Galway, have signed agreements to purchase their holdings at twenty-two-and-a-half years purchase, and that the size of six of the holdings is seven acres each; and, if so, whether, seeing that a grazing farm consisting of 50 acres belonging to the said landlord is in the immediate neighbourhood, and in view of the uneconomic size of their holdings, the Estates Commissioners will withhold their sanction to these agreements until an effort is made by them to acquire the grazing farm in the interest of these small tanants.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cviii., 910.

Mr. WYNDHAM: When application is made to the Commissioners in respect of the proposed sales, they will have due regard to all the circumstances before sanctioning the agreements.

Railway Rates for Irish Butter.

Mr. JOYCE (Limerick): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the fact that Irish traders cannot get through rates for butter from Ennistymon and Milltown Malbay, county Clare, to the English markets; that they have been asking for it for years, and have been refused; and, if so, whether, seeing that those traders are quite ready to pay the existing rates, but ask that it be entered as one rate, the Department in Ireland will take action in the matter.

Mr. WYNDHAM: A complaint to this effect has been made to the Department of Agriculture and is under investigation.

Sergeant Gallagher's Pension.

Mr. DELANY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will state what pension has been granted to Sergeant Gallagher, late of the Royal Irish Constabulary, Ballylinan, Queen's county, who at present fills an unestablished position in the Customs, Liverpool.

Mr. WYNDHAM: £41 18s. 2d. a year.

Mr. DELANY: Will his pension be applied to paying the debts he left behind him?

[No answer was returned.]

Division of Untenanted Land by the Estates Commissioners.

Mr. HAYDEN (Roscommon, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in the division of untenanted land acquired by the Estates Commissioners for the enlargement of small holdings and other purposes of the Purchase Act of last year, the Estates Commissioners will treat the herds employed on these lands as persons to whom money may be advanced to purchase one of the new holdings.

Mr. WYNDHAM: If the herd comes under one of the classes of persons mentioned in Section 2 of the Act, the Estates Commissioners will consider the advisability of giving him a parcel of land or, if they think fit and the land is available, they may make him a tenant and give him an advance under Section 53.

Labourers Acts—Unexpended Balances.

Mr. O'DOWD (Sligo, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state what course the Government propose to adopt in regard to the unexpended balances lying to the credit of several unions in Ireland under the Labourers Acts; and can he say how these balances are to be disposed of in the case of unions where the demand for the erection of labourers' cottages has not arisen and where such cottages are not required.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The question of the application of the unexpended balance of the Exchequer contribution is engaging consideration. It is not, however, proposed to deal with this balance in the Labourers Bill.

Weir Estate, County Sligo.

Mr. O'DOWD: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Weir Estate, situate near Riverstown, in the county of Sligo, is still under the jurisdiction of the Land Judge's Court; and, if so, will he explain why and under what circumstances the Knocalassa grazing farm, forming a portion of that estate, was sold to an outsider over the heads of the other tenants whose small farms could with advantage be enlarged by the breaking up of this ranche.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The estate is no longer under the administration or control of the Land Judge. The farm in question was sold before the passing of the Act of 1903.

Florence Knox Estate, County Mayo.

Mr. O'DOWD: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that untenanted land on the Florence Knox Estate, county Mayo, will, by order of the Land Judge, be offered for sale by auction on the 13th inst.; that the Ballina Rural District Council has adopted a resolution requesting the Estates Commissioners to secure the land for the purpose of relieving congestion in the neighbourhood; and that the tenants on adjoining uneconomic holdings have memorialised the Estates Commissioners, with a view to the improvement and enlargement of their holdings by the division amongst them of the untenanted land now offered for sale; and, if so, whether, in view of the fact that the district in question is congested, will he take steps to secure that in this case effect is given by the Estates Commissioners to the intentions of Parliament n passing the Land Act of last year.

Mr. WYNDHAM: An application for the purchase of this land has been made to the Commissioners, who have instructed one of their Inspectors to make an inspection and report.

Achonry National Schools.

Mr. O'DOWD: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can give the name of the present manager of the Achonry, county Sligo, National Schools; whether the manager resides in the district; and, if not, whether, in view of the fact that the estate on which these schools are situate has recently been sold to the Congested Districts Board, and that the inhabitants of the locality are Roman Catholics, he will recommend the Commissioners of National Education to appoint the Rev. B. Dunn, P.P., as manager.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The manager of the school is Mr. Charles Phibbs. He resides at Chaffpool, 2¾ miles distant from the school. The nomination of a manager does not rest with the Commissioners of National Education, but with the patron, Captain Armstrong.

Irish Guards and the R.I.C.

Mr. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state what arrangements, if any, have been made for the appointment to the Royal Irish Constabulary of pensioners from the Irish Guards.

Mr. WYNDHAM: Arrangements have been made for the admission to the force of a limited number of reservists from the Irish Guards. The number is at present limited to 100 in any one year, or 900 men in all at any one time.

Mr. MACVEAGH: While soldiers are being taken on recruiting for the R.I.C. is stopped. What is the arrangement?

Mr. WYNDHAM: Reservists must possess all the qualifications required from other candidates for the R.I.C. and they must also have had their names registered as candidates for the force within three months after their enlistment. None have, as yet, been admitted.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford: But has recruiting for the Constabulary been stopped?

Mr. WYNDHAM: Partially for this year, and after that it will proceed on the basis of the new scheme.

Ballyvarley (County Down) Disturbances.

Mr. MACVEAGH: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received any report as to the attack on two teams of hurlers at Ballyvarley, county Down, on Sunday; whether he is aware that Ballyvarley is a Nationalist district and that the inhabitants had no objection to the sports taking place in the district; whether District Inspector Bell or any of the police under him were witnesses of any of the assaults; whether District Inspector Bell has taken statements from any, and, if so, how many, civilians; whether any prosecutions are to be instituted; and whether steps are being taken to protect those engaged in legal sports on Sundays in this district.

MR. WYNDHAM: Yes, Sir; I have received a report of this occurrence. Proceedings will be instituted by the Crown against a number of persons. The reply to the concluding inquiry is in the affirmative.

Irish Department of Agriculture.

MR. JOYCE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will explain why the local technical committees as such were not in any way consulted by the Department in reference to the new directory, seeing that the paid officers of those committees were summoned to Dublin by the Department to take part in a consultation about the directory; and whether he will take steps to avoid a recurrence of this action.

MR. WYNDHAM: In respect of the first part of the Question I have nothing to add to my reply to the hon. Member's previous Question of the 18th April.† I will bring the suggestion at the end of the Question under the notice of the Department.

Lisburn Disturbances.

MR. JOSEPH DEVLIN (Kilkenny, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the fact that a disorderly demonstration took place in Lisburn on Saturday; whether he is aware that the three Orange bands which took part were imported from Belfast; and whether, in view of the fact that in the interests of peace the Nationalists abandoned their sports, he will make representations to the local Orange leaders as to the advisability of their pursuing a similar course.

MR. WYNDHAM: The occurrence to which the hon. Member refers was not a Party demonstration in the sense attached to that word in Ireland, but was merely one of numerous excursions that take place in the locality in the spring and summer months. It had no connection whatever with recent events in Lisburn. There was no disorder beyond a few cases of drunkenness.

MR. JOSEPH DEVLIN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in the case of the prosecution of a man named Robinson in connection with the Lisburn disturbances, he will arrange to have the prosecution taken up by the Crown, in view of the fact that the police were witnesses of Robinson's conduct.

MR. WYNDHAM: Proceedings have been instituted against Robinson for injury done to the goal posts, by the committee of the Lisburn Hurling Club. The case will be heard at petty sessions on Thursday next. The police authorities are of opinion, in which the Government concurs, that an amicable arrangement having been arrived at the better course for the Crown will be to leave the question of litigation to the parties.

Alleged Offensive Notice in Pallaskenry.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY (Limerick, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether it has been brought to his notice that in the public street in the village of Pallaskenry, in the county of Limerick, a notice in capital letters, offensive to Roman Catholics and calculated to promote religious animosity there, has been exhibited daily on a notice board on the walls of a house; and whether, in the interest of the peace of the locality, he will take steps to prevent its exhibition in future.

MR. WYNDHAM: The hon. Member has been good enough to send me a copy of the notice. I understand it has been displayed in its present position for thirty years, and that Roman Catholics manifest the utmost indifference to it. This, if I may say so, seems a very sensible attitude.

Kilkeel Petty Sessions.

MR. MACVEAGH: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the proceedings of the last petty sessions in Kilkeel, county Down; whether he is aware that a prosecution by the local guardians for overcrowding had to be adjourned for the third time owing to the refusal of Mr. Bull, R.M., to wait half-an-hour for the evidence of the dispensary doctor; and that it was explained that the doctor was delayed owing to the difficulty in obtaining a *locum tenens* for the dispensary work; and whether, in view of the inconvenience caused to the parties concerned, and of the fact that Mr. Bull is a public servant and had not to attend any other Court on that day, he will cause representations to be made to him as to the inconvenience produced by his conduct.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxxiii., 391.

Mr. WYNDHAM: This case has been before the Court on three different occasions. On the first the dispensary doctor, who is also Sanitary Medical Officer, was in Court. When called he refused to give evidence unless paid his fee of one guinea. The Solicitor for the district council refused to do this and asked for an adjournment. On the next occasion the doctor failed to appear, and an adjournment was again applied for and was granted. On the last occasion the case was first on the list. When called on the doctor again failed to appear, and the case was put at the bottom of the list. When it was reached the doctor was still absent, though his dispensary is very near to the Court-house. It was intimated that when the doctor had finished his business at the dispensary he would attend. This was an indefinite undertaking, which might mean minutes or hours, and the plaintiff again applied for a third adjournment. In the exercise of their discretion the magistrates, of whom Mr. Bull was one, granted the application. Their action was quite legitimate and proper.

Irish Land Commission Report.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can now state when the annual Report of the Irish Land Commission will be issued.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The Annual Report of the Land Commissioners deals with their proceedings in respect of each financial year ended 31st March. The Reports have hitherto, as a general rule, been presented in July or August. Every exertion will be used to complete the Report for 1903–4 in June. The major part of the Report consists of statistical tables which require much care and accuracy in their preparation; but if there is any particular set of tables which the hon. and learned Member would wish to have in advance the Commissioners will be happy to endeavour to meet his wishes as far as possible.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: We desire to have this Report—or as much of it as possible—before we discuss the Land Commission Vote, which it is intended to take on an early day.

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): Will the Report when presented contain a Report from the Estates Commissioners?

Mr. WYNDHAM: There is to be an Interim Report from the Estates Commissioners, but I think it would be unwise to try to increase the labour of the Land Commission by putting it in their Report, which I believe will be laid before the other is ready; I will do my best to facilitate the publication of that part of the Report, which the hon. Member may deem pertinent to the debate.

Royal Irish Constabulary and Public-House Property.

Mr. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland under what circumstances are members of the Royal Irish Constabulary stationed in districts where public-houses are situated in which they have an interest; and will he take steps to have them transferred elsewhere.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The regulations provide, in such a case, that the member of the force shall be stationed in another county.

Mr. SLOAN: If I give the right hon. Gentleman instances, will he see that the transfers are made?

Mr. WYNDHAM: Certainly.

Ballinasloe Asylum Medical Superintendent.

Mr. SLOAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of

Ireland if the appointment of Dr. Kirwan, to be medical superintendent of the Ballinasloe Asylum, over the head of Dr. Mills, who was acting superintendent, has been sanctioned; and, if so, on what grounds.

MR. WYNDHAM: The appointment has not yet been confirmed by the Lord-Lieutenant, who is in correspondence with the committee of management of the asylum on the subject.

County Meath School Teachers' Salaries.

MR. SAMUEL YOUNG (Cavan, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that two teachers in county Meath, Circuit 9, District 24, roll, boys' school 5,732, girls, 5,605, had their salaries reduced in consequence of an epidemic which lasted only two months, during which time the school was closed; whether it is the practice of the Board to continue full salaries for twelve months in the event of epidemics; if so, will he see that the money withheld be now paid to these teachers.

MR. WYNDHAM: The question of the payment made to the teachers of these schools will be reconsidered by the Commissioners.

Banbridge Disturbances.

MR. MACVEAGH: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland a Question, of which I have given him private notice, whether he is aware that an Orange drumming party were allowed to assemble in Banbridge, county Down, on Thursday, with the object of preventing an Irish concert in the local town hall; that district Inspector Bell allowed the mob to demonstrate in front of the Town Hall and made no effort to disperse the party; and that the houses of Nationalist traders and citizens were subsequently attacked by them; and, if so, will he say whether any of the rioters will be prosecuted.

MR. WYNDHAM: I only received the notice as I came into the House and have not had time to get any information. If the hon. Member will put the Question down on the Paper I will answer it.

Bank of Ireland and Imperial Moneys.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if, taking the average daily balances over the financial year 1903–4, he can state approximately the total balance held by the Bank of Ireland, from day to day, on the head of Imperial Revenue and of other Irish Government moneys in respect of which no interest was allowed by the Bank to the State.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The average daily balance on the Exchequer account at the Bank of Ireland in the financial year 1903–4 was approximately £662,000. The average total of the balances on the last day of each month in that year of the other accounts of public moneys on which no interest is allowed by the Bank was about £1,193,000. I have already explained that the benefit derived from the use of these balances constitutes the Bank's remuneration for the work entailed by the Government accounts, and was also taken into consideration in 1892 when the Bank's remuneration for management of the public debt was last fixed.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: But is there any reason why the Bank of Ireland should have a monopoly of this business?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Yes, because they keep all the Government accounts and because of the relations which exist between the Government and the Bank.

Sunday Postal Delivery at Knocknagoshel County Kerry.

MR. MURPHY: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether any decision has yet been arrived at in reference to the application to have letters delivered on Sunday at Knocknagoshel, county Kerry; and if, in view of the inconvenience existing, he will cause the necessary change to be made forthwith.

LORD STANLEY: I have received no recent application for a Sunday delivery at Knocknagoshel, but when the question was last considered it was found that owing to the comparatively high cost of the existing postal service in that district, the expense of affording the desired improvement would not have been justified. I am having further inquiry made to ascertain if there is any change in circumstances and I will inform the hon. Member of the result.

Dublin College of Science.

MR. MOONEY (Dublin County, S.): On behalf of the hon. Member for South Kerry, I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury can he state to what authority was the selection of the architect for the new College of Science in Dublin due; and can he state how long ago was the selection made.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY (Mr. VICTOR CAVENDISH, Derbyshire, W.): The Treasury is responsible for this selection, which it authorised on the 4th ultimo.

Licensing Bill.

SIR JOHN LENG (Dundee): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in the event of the Licensing Bill for England becoming law, its provisions will be extended to the other parts of the United Kingdom.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): This Question is of a somewhat hypothetical character. Perhaps we had better wait until we pass the Bill before deciding the point.

Votes of Absentee Electors.

SIR ELLIOT LEES (Birkenhead): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he is prepared to take any steps to give effect to the Resolution passed by the House on the 8th March in favour of means being given whereby mariners, fishermen, railway servants, and others may record their votes at Parliamentary elections when, by reason of their calling, they will be absent on duty on the day of the poll.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I see no objection to appointing a Committee; at any rate, the Government will offer no opposition to the Select Committee the hon. Gentleman desires. If he will consult with the President of the Local Government Board as to the reference to that Committee, I have no doubt he will find no difficulty in drawing up its terms in a manner to meet the case.

Ground Landlords and Licensed Houses.

MR. CREMER (Shoreditch, Haggerston): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he can state the number of public-houses that have been closed during the last ten or twenty years by the ground landlords of London; whether he has any official information showing that when closing public-houses upon their estates the ground landlords compensate the publicans for depriving them of their licences; whether it is the practice of the landlords to give the licence-holders anything besides timely notice that after a specified time their establishments will be closed; and, if not, will he cause inquiries to be made into the matter.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: We have no official information on the subject on which the hon. Gentleman desires an inquiry, neither have we the machinery for making such an inquiry.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): What class of Supply will be taken next Thursday?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have little hope that the debate on the Licensing Bill will close much before Wednesday. The Vote in Thursday's Supply that has been asked for is the Lunacy Vote, and I propose to put it down first. The second set of Votes will be those relating to the Post Office, unless the right hon. Gentleman or other hon. Members desire some alteration in the programme.

A QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

*MAJOR JAMESON (Clare, W.): I desire to call your attention, Sir, to a serious breach of privilege. It is in reference to a circular which came to me last Thursday from the Church of England Temperance Society, and they had the bad taste to put the name of His Majesty on the top of it. I believe His Majesty is a constitutional monarch, and——

*Mr. SPEAKER: Does the hon. Member say that he received it on Thursday morning?

*Major JAMESON: Yes, Sir.

*Mr. SPEAKER: Then the hon. Member should at once have brought it before the House.

*Major JAMESON: I may remind you, Sir, that I asked you whether I should bring up the matter to-day.

*Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, but the hon. Member did not tell me that he received the circular on Thursday. He did communicate to me the fact that he had received the communication, and I do not think I am depriving the hon. Member of any useful opportunity, for I came to the conclusion and so informed him that there was nothing in the circular which I could submit to the House.

*Major JAMESON: I think, Sir, you cannot have read the circular, or you would agree with me. What I wanted to say was that the name of the hon. Member for Norwood appears on the paper, and I think that he and the secretary should be summoned to the Bar at once.

*Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot go into that. A matter of this kind ought to be brought before the House at once.

THE PORT OF LONDON BILL.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): I wish to ask, Mr. Speaker, for your ruling on a question connected with the Motion standing in the name of the President of the Board of Trade, "That the proceedings on the Port of London Bill may be resumed." The Standing Order referring to this Bill is headed, "Special Standing Order for the Session 1904"—a title which has no authority—and it provides for the carrying over of the Bill from last session to the "next session." The point I wish to raise is one of great importance. If this is a Standing Order, it must remain in force until rescinded by the House; and, therefore, if the Bill does not go through in the present session, it might be carried over until next session. I wish to know if that is your view of the matter.

*Mr. SPEAKER: This is no doubt a Standing Order and I think the heading correctly describes what it is. As to the words "next session," they clearly apply to this particular session. The Standing Order was passed in 1903, and a reference to the Journals of the House would plainly show what session was referred to as "next." It is not an unknown form of Standing Order; and, when the operation of such an Order lapses, it is usual to omit it when reprinting the Standing Orders of the House.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES: Will this Standing Order, even if it is not rescinded by a Motion of this House, lapse with the session?

*Mr. SPEAKER: Yes; it is usual, as I have said, to omit such an Order when reprinting the Standing Orders of the House.

NEW BILL.

PARLIAMENTARY VOTERS (REGISTRATION) BILL.

"To amend the Law relating to the Qualification and Registration of Parliamentary Voters, and for other purposes relating to Elections," presented by Mr. Cremer; supported by Mr. Bell, Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. Burt, Mr. John Burns, Mr. Crooks, Mr. Fenwick, Mr. Arthur Henderson, Mr. John Johnson, Mr. Parrott, Mr. Shackleton, and Mr. John Wilson (Durham); to be read a second time upon Thursday, and to be printed. [Bill 189.]

LICENSING BILL.

[Second Reading.]

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

*Mr. BURT (Morpeth): I move that this Bill be read a second time upon this day six months. This is a bad Bill, it cannot be made into a good one, and that seems to me to be a sufficient reason for my Motion. The Home Secretary, in introducing the Bill, stated that he believed it would put an end to controversies upon this subject, and that it would promote temperance. We shall see as to whether it will end controveries; my own belief is that it will open up new controversies without settling any of the old ones. If I could believe that it was a Bill which would promote temperance I certainly would not be here to move its rejection. The Prime Minister said a good deal in his speech on the introduction of the Bill about the intemperance of speech on the part of temperance advocates. I am not here to defend those speakers. I recognise, however, that many of them have shown very great disinterestedness in devoting themselves to a great and beneficent reform. Occasionally, no doubt, they may have shown themselves to be extravagant, fanatical, exaggerative, but there is one thing which they can never exaggerate. They cannot exaggerate the evils which spring from the traffic in intoxicating drink. I usually, when I wish to say anything about these evils, select phrases from well-known authorities who know the subject intimately. I shall quote from Mr. Charles Buxton who was once Member of Parliament for Weymouth, and I am glad that we still have a Buxton a Member of this House. Now, Mr. Buxton was a philanthropist, a lover of his fellow-men, a devout Christian, a good man, and a brewer. He once wrote an article on the subject of how to stop drunkenness, and in the first page of that article he said—

> "If you add together all the evils generated in our time by war, pestilence, and famine—the three great scourges of mankind—they do not exceed those which spring from this one calamity of our national drunkenness."

On the next page he said—

> "The struggle of the school, the library, and the Church all united against the beer-house and the gin palace, is but one development of the war between heaven and hell."

The evils are admitted; hundreds of Acts of Parliament have been passed to deal with them; and nobody in this House can say that the present condition of affairs is satisfactory. There is one thing upon which we are all agreed, and that is that there are too many public-houses, and that it is desirable to diminish them. This Bill is professedly an attempt to dimnish the number of public-houses. It may perhaps be a matter of opinion as to whether the lessening of the number of public-houses diminishes drunkenness. Some people say it does, others say that it does not. My own opinion is that it depends very much upon circumstances. There have been instances in which a lessening of the number of public-houses has diminished drunkenness and other instances in which it has not. In this connection I will quote Mr. Arthur Chamberlain, to whom, I think, the nation owes a deep debt of gratitude for the courage, public-spiritedness, and disinterestedness with which he has tackled the subject. In a speech Mr. Arthur Chamberlain delivered at Leeds a few months ago, he said—

> "In Birmingham, where for many years we have reduced the number of licences by twenty or thirty each year out of a total of over 2,000, our action spread over the whole town had no effect in reducing drunkenness; it could not be expected to have any effect in reducing drunkenness. Then we fixed our attention to a definite area with 115 licences and refused the renewal of fifty-four licences. We did this with the consent of the brewers. It was before the day of Mr. Balfour's unhappy interference. The result of refusing fifty-four licences was a decrease in the arrests for drunkenness in that district by 30 per cent. and the improvement continues to this day."

In the case of Liverpool, according to an answer of the Home Secretary in February last, the amount of indictable crime and intemperance in 1902 was only one-third of what it was in 1890, and during the period of twelve years ending 1902 the number of public-houses in Liverpool had been reduced by 493. On this point there is some very important information in the Judicial Statistics of 1899. It may be said that Birmingham and Liverpool are county boroughs and that the same process could go on under this Bill. Even in the case of county boroughs the powers of the magistrates are considerably weakened and it is quite certain to my mind that under this Bill it would be impossible for this process to have been carried on to anything like the same extent in Birmingham and Liverpool. The enormous compensation demanded and the comparative smallness of the amount of money available would make it absolutely impossible to diminish to any considerable degree the number of public-houses under this Bill. I do not want to weary the House with extracts, but I will quote again from Mr. Arthur Chamberlain. He says—

> "I have calculated the amount that would be raised in Birmingham by the proposed tax and I have checked the results by an independent estimate made by the Clerk to the City Justices. I find the maximum sum produced in Birmingham would be about £14,000. This would not allow a reduction of more than seven licences per annum."

At the present time licences in Birmingham are being reduced at the rate of thirty per annum. Mr. Arthur Chamberlain proceeds—

> "That would take 180 years to bring down the number of licences in Birmingham to the proportion recommended by the Royal Commission."

This refers to the Royal Commission appointed by the present Government, and presided over by a nobleman for whom we all entertain the greatest admiration. Mr. Arthur Chamberlain goes on to say that this effect would follow throughout the whole country. I will not go into further detail because I think this in itself absolutely and completely condemns the present Bill.

The system upon which we have hitherto dealt with this licensing question has been by the licensing magistrates, and this Bill very considerably cripples, if it does not entirely destroy, the power of the magistrates to deal effectively with the diminution of the number of public-houses. You transfer the power from the local magistrates to the quarter sessions. I do not know that magistrates are in any case particularly amenable to public opinion, but quarter sessions are much less amenable to public opinion than the local justices. The local justices, at any rate, do understand local circumstances and the requirements of the district. I do not say that this is an appeal from Philip sober to Philip drunk, because the magistrate as Philip is always sober, but I do say it is an appeal from intimate and complete local knowledge, not perhaps to ignorance, but to less complete knowledge of local circumstances. Surely one of the requisites of sound judgment is knowledge. I know it is not the only one, because you also want impartiality and a certain amount of intellect, but you do require knowledge; and I suppose the magistrates, as a rule, are not likely to be biased on a question of this kind, nor can I believe that quarter sessions are more likely to be judicial and fair in determining the question than are the local magistrates.

I find myself to-day in an unexpected position. I never dreamt in my wildest excursions of fancy that it would devolve upon me to stand up in defence of the magistrates against the attacks of a Tory Government. I am not astonished, because, after thirty years in this House, the poetry, the romance, and the surprises of life have vanished. The magistrates are not a revolutionary body. I suppose the great majority of them have been appointed by Conservative Governments, and that they are nearly all Conservatives, if not in politics, in character and position. And yet the Government do not trust them. Well, I must do the Government the justice to say that they do not always treat their friends so scurvily. But I suppose there was a conflict of interests, and with their usual chivalry they have sacrificed the interests of the weaker to the stronger. What is the magistrates' offence? It is because they have been to some extent responsive to the enlightened public opinion of the country, and they have used their power to some small extent during the last few years in diminishing the number of public-houses and the evils that spring from them.

Now I will say a word or two on the question of compensation. I myself have for many years been very strongly opposed in principle to any sort of compensation. There is no legal claim. That is admitted. The Home Secretary frankly admitted that there is no legal claim. I do not know that there is any moral claim. I do not think that there is any claim in equity. I admit it may be advisable on grounds of expediency and policy, as a sort of compassionate allowance, as somebody said, and for the sake of accomplishing a great public object to forego—and I would be one of the first to forego—our legal claims, and give compensation, even though we may consider that it is tinctured with a sort of injustice. What public object is going to be gained by compensation in these circumstances? We gave compensation in the case of purchase in the Army. We said, and said very truly in that case, that there was no legal claim, and that the buying of commissions was illegal. But compensation was paid. I have no doubt that some other cases could be found, for this House never deals untenderly or unkindly with vested interests, especially if they are the vested interests of the well-to-do. I recall the case in which £20,000.000 were given to abolish slavery, and after all we have less glorious pages in our history than that. But in both of these cases the evil was uprooted. It was ended altogether. But this does not end the evil. It establishes, it entrenches, it strengthens the position so far as the drink traffic is concerned. It may be said that the money is to be found by the trade. Is it? If it is I would say with my right hon friend behind me, why does not the trade manage the affair from beginning to end? It is powerful enough, it is combined, it is very capable of taking care of itself, or this Bill would not be under discussion here to-day. I read a speech a day or two ago delivered by the hon. Member for South Derbyshire who was presiding, I think, at the annual meeting of the Licensed Victuallers' Association. Speaking of this Bill, he said—

> "He thought they would be wise in accepting the Bill."

he did not seem to be very sure—

> "It required amending, but in it they found the great principle that a licence-holder's property was his own, and that if it was to be taken away he was to be paid for it."

I do not know where the hon. Gentleman gets his law. I do not think the law says that the licence is his own. It is a privilege conferred by the State that the State may take away. It is admittedly given for a year, and for a year only. Then we have the enormously enhanced value of the licences that this Bill will confer. Licences, according to Mr. Arthur Chamberlain, have a capital value of £300,000,000, and he states that this Bill doubles their value, making it £600,000,000. I am not a Chancellor of the Exchequer, or an ex-Chancellor of the Exchequer, and I am a very poor arithmetician. Fractions and millions always perplex me. These are large amounts. The increased value is, I maintain, State created, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer when framing his next Budget should look out to see that he gets his share of this additional £300,000,000. I have no doubt it will help him very considerably. He is carrying a heavy load. I am not saying that he is staggering under it because he does not stagger, but it is a tremendous load. I have no doubt if he would consult his uncle he would tell him where he could get, and get honestly from public money or money that ought to belong to the public, a few millions that would greatly help him in his financial difficulties, and there always will be financial difficulties so long as this Government is in power. Napoleon said he found the vices much better taxpayers than the virtues. Well, if that great military genius, that evil genius, could come back again, which heaven forbid, I know somebody who could show him how to bleed the virtues and let the vices off, if not scot-free, certainly on the easiest possible terms.

This Bill, in my opinion, begins at the wrong end. It safeguards the interests of the trade, but absolutely leaves unprotected the greater interests of the public. In fact it makes new raids upon the public. The Prime Minister strongly deprecated the attacks of temperance advocates on the publicans. But I think the right hon. Gentleman must have been very unfortunate in his visits to temperance meetings, because I have attended a good many and have never yet heard a publican attacked. I am not going to attack the publicans. I have a good many friends among them. I have known many good ones and I never knew a thoroughly bad one. Many of them are my friends, and some of them have even voted for me. And considering that I am not one of their best customers, I think it was very disinterested of them to treat me so kindly. I do not think, however, that they need any particular defence. I think, like other good people, they are sometimes only too conscious of their virtues. I have it from the Archbishop of Canterbury that there is apparently a great rivalry between the Church and the trade as to which of them rear the most virtuous families. The Archbishop, quoting from the "Licensed Victuallers' Annual," said that they actually declared, deliberately affirmed, that it is a matter of statistical proof, that the publicans' families turn out very much better than the clergymen's. Now, I would just warn my publican friends that it does not necessarily follow that the public-house is a better school of morals than the Church. There may be other circumstances. Look at the pains that we take in selecting the publican. No man of bad character has a shadow of a chance of getting a licence. I can speak very disinterestedly on this subject, because I have taken great care never to apply for anything that requires a very high standard of character. Now, all I can say is that we are all interested in this question, and I hope that this wholesome rivalry in the rearing of virtuous families will go on with moderation and without acrimony.

There is another matter still of a domestic kind which concerns me still more, and that is John Bull's family, and the effect that this Bill is likely to have upon that family. Now, John has a very big and heterogeneous family. Many of his children are in rags, living on the verge of starvation, and their poverty, their misery, and their crime is largely caused by the traffic in intoxicating liquor. John has a big income; and, if he would but spend it wisely instead of worse than wasting so much of it on fireworks and intoxicants, there would be enough and to spare for everyone. I do not think that we, on this side of the House, alone desire to remedy this evil. I do not think that the Government is indifferent to it. What is the cure? Is there a cure? Can nothing whatever be done? The Prime Minister seems to think—he says, and I am sure he thinks it—that we will never get rid of the public-house in this country. Well, Sir, the right hon. Gentleman is a logician; he is an expert dialectician. I admire him in that capacity, especially when he has a bad case. His reputation as a logician is assured and unassailable, but I beg him to have some regard for his reputation as a prophet. Is it not hazardous for him to lay down a universal negative proposition on a subject of this kind, with no time limit? The public-house, as a house of resort for the public, is a necessity, and probably will remain a necessity; but the right hon. Gentleman uses the term in its usual acceptation as a place for drinking. He does not know. The Prime Minister knows what is; he does not know what may be. The time may come, hopeless as the outlook is, when the insatiable thirst of our countrymen may abate, or when they may go back to the less fiery and stimulating and simpler liquor such as I believe sufficed to meet the wants of our first parents. I admit that we have to deal, as practical men, with the subject as it is; but can anything be done now? I think something can be done. We cannot go, I admit, in advance of public opinion; but do not let us lag behind public opinion; do not, above everything, let us try to throttle, thwart, and defeat enlightened public opinion. I myself have great faith in education. We have been watching His Majesty the King's visit to Ireland. I read a speech of His Majesty's which interested me very much. I thought it better than any King's speech I have ever seen introduced by any Government—in which His Majesty said: "In the better education of the people lies the one great hope for the future." Well, I believe that—not in the technical, conventional sense, not simply in the teaching of elementary knowledge or even in carrying it beyond the elements—but the development and perfection of the whole man, physical, moral, intellectual—spiritual, if you like—teaching men habits of gentleness, justice, and self-restraint. These things Governments cannot do. They cannot impart these qualities. "Therein the patient must minister to himself." But Governments can do something; they may do much. They may provide healthier and better surroundings, physical and moral. To use the language of a great statesman whose memory is dear to millions of his fellow-countrymen and to multitudes beyond the seas, it should be the business of Governments to make it easy for the people to do right and difficult for them to do wrong. Well, Sir, this Bill goes not a step in that direction. It carries us backward. It increases the difficulty. It tends to strengthen and perpetuate our great national curse, and I move its rejection.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day six months.'"—(*Mr. Burt*).

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

VISCOUNT MORPETH (Birmingham, S.) said he wished to ask the indulgence of the House on the first occasion on which he had ventured to address it. On the occasion of the First Reading of the Bill, when the Prime Minister declared that this was a temperance Bill, he was met with laughter by hon. Gentlemen opposite. If it were not a temperance Bill a great many of his hon. friends would not, however, be supporting it. Hon. Gentlemen opposite had no monopoly of the desire to promote temperance. If they had any such monopoly they had used it very badly for the last thirty years, because they had passed no temperance legislation, and had only been strong enough to throw out Bills which had been proposed, but not strong enough to carry Bills of their own. He did not intend to criticise what was called the temperance party. The drink question was a terrible question and a complicated question, and a question which undoubtedly entailed great evils on the people of this country. They all recognised that the temperance party, who had devoted themselves to the work of diminishing drunkenness, had accomplished a great work for which they could not possibly be criticised; but when he considered their political action and the course they had adopted in the House he did not think that their record was quite as satisfactory. They had opposed legislation, and they had said that the only settlement to which they would agree would be a settlement according to their own ideas. Teetotalers —he was a teetotaler himself—were in a vast minority in the country. The great majority of the people without being drunkards desired to drink, and it was impossible for the small minority of teetotalers to dictate to the majority. Water drinking had not, however, diminished the natural combativeness of the temperance party in their incursion into the political domain as they had, to a certain extent, lost sight of their proper work, namely, the reclamation of drunkards and the prevention of others from becoming drunkards. He maintained that from the point of view of temperance there was nothing to be gained and a great deal to be lost when the temperance party forgot their primary work and developed a Party spirit and a political agitation. No man was saved from temptation by that course; and the whole movement was turned into a wrong direction by it.

Thirty years ago there was an opportunity of passing a measure, which, had it been passed, would, ere now, have succeeded in bringing about a better condition of affairs. Mr. Bruce's Bill provided a ratio of population and a time limit of ten years which would have expired long ago if the Bill had been passed. A generation would not have been lost and a very material step forward in the direction of temperance would have been taken. Instead of that, the only measure proposed by Gentlemen mainly identified with the temperance party was a measure of local option. He did not intend to discuss the question of prohibition; and he thought it would be admitted that prohibition—whether State prohibition or local prohibition—had been a failure in the past, and had not cured the evil which it was intended to cure. Besides failing in its primary object it also caused the added evil of disobedience to the law. He remembered an unwilling supporter of local option saying he was in favour of it because he was convinced that there was not a single district in England where it could be put into force; and from the point of view of temperance it would be quite an illusory measure. He thought that greater advantage would be derived from a measure which was not so far-reaching or sweeping as local option, but which would reduce public-houses to a far greater extent. He knew there were some people who said that the need for a reduction in the number of public-houses had not been proved by statistics; but it was a matter of common sense and common knowledge that if they reduced public-houses they would also reduce drunkenness and drinking. All experience was in that direction. When Parliament gave what almost amounted to free trade in public-houses it was followed by a great increase in drunkenness. Since 1830 public-houses had been reduced in number, and brought under more stringent control; and the result was that the amount of drunkenness in the country had diminished, at any rate, to a certain extent. Again, with fewer public-houses, not only in the towns but also in the country, police supervision would be immeasurably greater; and, more important still, there would not be that keen competition between the lower classes of public-houses which existed at present. He thought the House did not always realise how difficult it was, in a little country town where there was a congestion of public-houses with a very small business possessed by each, for a publican to make a living of even the most precarious character. A great many of the small houses hardly paid their way, and the publican was forced very often into the most disreputable and improper means of earning a living. He thought, therefore, that it would be agreed that a reduction was desirable.

He thought also they need not stay to argue the question of the discretion of the magistrates. He did not think that anyone would deny that the magistrates had full control. As to the question of compensation, which was the main point in the Bill, he did not think they need stop to argue regarding its merits at any great length. The necessity for compensation had been admitted by both the Majority and Minority Reports of the Licensing Commission. The Minority Report said that it was a question of expediency and a matter of grace, and the hon. Member for the Spen Valley used similar expressions in his Report. Since then a manifesto had been issued by a number of temperance reformers in which the expediency and justice of some kind of compensation was admitted. Therefore the question need not be argued on its merits; but they would require to ask three things—was the compensation proposed excessive? should there be a time limit? and would the number of public-houses be sufficiently reduced? With regard to the question of the time limit, he knew that a great many temperance reformers were anxious to see a limit introduced, even if it were for such a lengthy period as twenty or thirty years. It was an attractive proposal that at the end of a certain period the country should not be liable for compensation of any sort to the trade; but he did not think that they would escape from their difficulties if a time limit were introduced as they would only be throwing the difficulty off their own shoulders on to the shoulders of those who would have to deal with the matter at another time. Under the Bill there would be a very material reduction in the number of public-houses; and it would be impossible to expect a man to invest capital in a public-house if he were to be dispossessed at the end of a year. If a time limit were to be introduced, it seemed to him it would be essential to change the yearly licensing system which now existed into a five years or seven years licence. It would be far better not to introduce a time limit, but to review the licences every year and compensate any licensee whose licence was taken away, from the fund to be raised by the trade. It was a condition put forward in the Reports of the Licensing Commission by the gentlemen who admitted the principle of compensation, that compensation should come from the trade and not from the public; but what they had given with one hand, they now seemed to be taking away with the other, because they stated that the money to be raised by the trade did not really belong to the trade but to the Government. That was an almost Oriental maxim of government.

Was the amount of compensation proposed by the Government sufficient for the reduction of public-houses? The hon. Member for Morpeth read a passage from an article written by Mr. Arthur Chamberlain giving the amount available for the reduction of public-houses in Birmingham, and he put the reduction down as seven public-houses per annum; but if the hon. Gentleman had consulted the Return which had been presented to the House he would find that Mr. Arthur Chamberlain had underestimated the amount by nearly one half, and that in

Birmingham double the number of public-houses estimated by him would be abolished every year. Mr. Arthur Chamberlain also pointed out that the diminution arising from the refusal of licences on the ground of misconduct or by reason of character or structure would continue. There were certain districts in the country in which no doubt little or nothing would be done; but there were many other districts in which the magistrates would be anxious and willing to make very material reductions. For that reason he should like to have the compensation fund increased if possible, and that might be done by increasing the amount to be paid by the larger houses. He could not see any reason for this falling off. It was quite probable the houses shut up would be the small houses, but he could not see that that was a reason why the bigger houses should not help to pay compensation, having regard to the trade they derived from the shutting up of the smaller houses. Another source of income, the tax upon clubs, was left out of the Bill. As public-houses were closed, and in proportion as they were closed by this drastic measure, so clubs would spring up, and it seemed to him only fair that, as those clubs would have their profits increased owing to the closing of public houses, they should pay something towards their extinction.

The hon. Member for Morpeth had suggested that the magistrates had been thrown over because they were the weaker of the two parties competing for the friendship of the Government. The magistrates were a very influential body and he did not think the features of this Bill had been influenced by any thoughts of that kind. Under this Bill the magistrates were not dispossessed; their functions had been readjusted and in some directions increased. Had it been possible he would have preferred to see something in the nature of a joint committee of magistrates and county councillors, and he would have liked to see the control under the county councils, under which bodies they would get an authority which they would not obtain from a plebiscite or under local veto. But that was a very strong step to take at the present time and therefore everybody would be glad that the discretion of the magistrates was retained. In the county boroughs the powers of the magistrates had been increased instead of being diminished, and if they turned to the counties, and the administration of licences in the counties, the only ground for saying that the power of the magistrates was reduced was the transfer of the application from the petty to the quarter sessions. Hon. Gentlemen opposite who had taken the magistrates under their protection had not extended their friendship to magistrates who sat in quarter sessions, yet the men who sat in quarter sessions were the same men who sat in petty sessions the only difference being that they were collected in some county town. Although the petty sessions was an excellent Court everybody would agree that it was by no means an ideal Court for dealing with these matters. Neither for that matter was the quarter sessions. He had seen at quarter sessions sixty or seventy magistrates come down who never by any chance attended on any other occasion, some of them keen temperance reformers and others on the other side, and he had seen such Courts sit for three days upon licensing questions. Such Courts could not deal with licensing in a judicial and proper spirit, and it would be of the greatest advantage for the power to be taken from such a Court and handed over to a small committee which would review the cases all over the country, and which would come to an impartial decision. It was said by some that if a case was transferred to the quarter sessions it was taken away from the public Court, but the county town was not so far away; the persons who would form the Court were representative of the people sitting in the local Court, and what local knowledge they had not themselves they could easily obtain. They would be in exactly the same position as the highways committee which had charge of the roads throughout the county. It was a fact that it was perfectly easy for the chairman of quarter sessions sitting in the county town to review the whole affairs of the county. Instead of being flouted and dispossessed under this Bill, the magistrates on the contrary, had a greater control than they enjoyed in the past. The Bill would do away with the partiality which had been shown under the present system.

He was fully conscious of the greatness of the evil with which they had to do, and he recognised all that had been said by the hon. Member for Morpeth. Intemperance was injurious alike to the welfare and health of the community; it was a bar to all true progress, and in the towns and boroughs where the people lived what must be an unwholesome life, the evil became more injurious, and the difficulty of dealing with it greater. But because they were not prepared to say that prohibition was the way to deal with it, and because they believed that this Bill and later systematic changes would help temperance, hon. Gentlemen opposite had no right to assume that those in favour of this Bill were not in favour of temperance reform. He welcomed this measure of the Government's because it gave them a measure at once. It did not put them off as they had been put off for the past thirty years with the suggestion that they should wait until a more complete measure could be passed; it was a step, an instalment in the direction of reduction, and it would be for the benefit of the cause of temperance reform.

*SIR JAMES WOODHOUSE (Huddersfield), speaking as having been the chairman of licensing magistrates in one of the large cities of the country, said he was keenly disappointed that a Gentleman like the noble Lord, whose family had been so closely associated with temperance reform, was going to support this Bill. If the noble Lord had understood what would be the working of it he would have come to a very different conclusion. He was, no doubt, sincere in his belief that this Bill would conduce to the reduction of the number of public-houses and so to temperance reform, but a close study of the Bill ought to lead him to quite a different conclusion. The real object of the Bill was not to protect the public but to safeguard the trade. That was admitted by the Home Secretary in his introduction of the measure, and if it had been specially drawn by somebody connected with the trade it could not have better answered the purpose. Had the Government followed the recommendations of their own Royal Commission they would have done something to reduce the number of public-houses, but the process of this Bill was so cumbersome and slow, and so restricted and limited in its effect, that it was impossible that it could be effectual in reducing licences to any great extent. It dealt with a traffic which, according to the Majority Report of the Commission, was productive of the greatest evil and national degradation, and under the circumstances the Government should have applied themselves to a Bill which would really have mitigated the evil and been in favour of temperance reform. This trade was a monopoly which brought to those who carried it on enormous wealth, influence, and political power; it was a monopoly for which they ought to pay because it produced serious and detrimental results to the community. It also entailed a large cost to the community in the provision and maintenance of the police, workhouses, and hospitals, and therefore it was only right that the trade should pay for the monopoly they held. This Bill would turn a temporary yearly interest into a permanent vested right, and a temporary lucrative privilege into a vested interest of enormous value. It would do that not only in the case of old licences, but, in the teeth of the unanimous recommendation of the Royal Commission, in the case of new licences also, so that the recipient of a new licence would practically be given a valuable present which could only be taken away by the State, in the public interests, after paying a large sum in excess of what was paid for it. But even more serious in its effect upon temperance reform was the fact that the Bill would turn a worthless licence also into a vested interest, and thus prevent a continuance of the voluntary reductions which had been taking place during the last few years. In the large cities and towns, in consequence of the changed character of certain neighbourhoods, many licences became worthless, and the owners were glad to give them up because of the impossibility of making the property pay. In Liverpool alone, since 1889, ten licences per year on an average had been voluntarily surrendered. The effect of this Bill would be to stop this surrender.

As to compensation, the contributions to the compensation fund were to be made on the basis of the rateable value. The rateable value of these houses, however, was nothing like the real value. A public-house rated at £700 would sometimes fetch £30,000 in the market. But while the contributions were to be assessed according to the rateable value, compensation was to be paid on the basis of the real value, and he submitted that it was necessary that the basis of contribution should bear some relation to the basis of compensation if a proper fund was to be provided. The Bill fettered and limited the control and discretion of the magistrates in a number of ways. In fact, the anomalies in the Bill were most extraordinary. At present when a renewal was applied for the application was heard by the full bench of magistrates, and if the application were refused an appeal could be made to quarter sessions, but under the Bill there were two tribunals and two jurisdictions. A full bench of magistrates would be competent to deal with the question of whether a licence should be taken away on the ground of misconduct on the part of the holder or of unsuitability of premises, but the moment it came to the question of whether the licence was necessary for the neighbourhood they became quite incompetent to deal with it, and the determination of the point was left to a smaller body—a committee of themselves. An anomaly of that sort would not be appreciated by the great body of magistrates. Then in regard to an application for a new licence the proposal in the Bill was equally absurd. Under the present law an application for a new licence had to go before a licensing committee of seven. If granted, it was then taken before a confirming body—the full bench of magistrates—and if they refused there was no appeal. But under this Bill an application first went before this small body of seven, and then to another special committee of the same number, with the Recorder in the chair, for confirmation, which meant that the full bench of magistrates would be ignored altogether. A more anomalous and complex system of procedure could not be put into an Act of Parliament. Why had not the Government adopted the recommendation of their own Royal Commission, in which the representatives of the trade concurred, viz., that if a new authority was to be constituted it should be composed partly of magistrates and partly of members elected by the town council? That, at any rate, would have been better than the present proposal and was adopted for Scotland last year. There was yet a further anomaly. The Acts from 1828 to 1902 would have to be read together; therefore as it was not taken away, there would still be an appeal to quarter sessions on the questions of misconduct, structural defects, or unsuitability of premises; but there would be no appeal on the question of non-requirement by the neighbourhood. The Government did not seem to understand their own Bill or the effect of its own procedure. If they did understand it, it was difficult to conceive how they could place such an absurd proposal before the House of Commons and the country. The effect of the Bill would be to retard temperance reform, which all social reformers so greatly desired, and therefore he should support the Amendment.

*Mr. CRIPPS (Lancashire, Stretford) said the hon. Member for the Morpeth Division had not dealt with the difficulties of this question. All were keenly alive to the evils of intemperance, and were desirous of a fair measure of temperance reform. The problem was how to secure at the same time a fair measure of justice to the brewer and the publican and a fair measure of social reform from the temperance point of view. He believed the present Bill was a valuable measure of reform as regarded the licensing system of the country. The first question to be considered was the advisability of making the alteration proposed by the Bill in regard to the administrative action of the magistrates in refusing the renewal of licences which in their opinion were not required. Two conditions were necessary in any true administrative reform, viz., that a discretionary power should be given to the county authority, and that that county authority should be autonomous within its own area. In that respect the opponents of the Bill did not appear to appreciate the distinction which at present existed. In the county borough there was no autonomy, inasmuch as an appeal against a refusal to renew a licence lay from the county borough to the quarter sessions of the neighbouring county authority.

SIR JAMES WOODHOUSE: So there is under this Bill.

***MR. CRIPPS** was certain the hon. Member was mistaken. The object of the Bill was to make the county borough authority autonomous and independent within its own area. That was a measure of reform, though to refer to a matter of detail, he agreed it was a mistake in an administrative matter of this kind to introduce the Recorder, who was nothing more than a judicial authority. That, however, was a matter for discussion, and he hoped it would be put right in Committee. He sometimes wondered whether the various advocates of temperance reform were really cognisant of the result of granting discretionary power to magistrates in country districts. The petty sessional division was altogether too small an area to properly exercise discretion in regard to the refusal or renewal of existing licences, and so long as they retained the existing power within those areas so long would they have but little temperance reform They were having no real temperance reform at the present moment, although occasionally some particular bench took an extreme view; but if they took the country as a whole he challenged any advocate of temperance to prove that this discretionary power within petty sessional districts had in substance and in truth promoted temperance reform. This was not the fault of the magistrates. The fault was that they could not introduce any fair system either of shutting up public-houses or compensating public-houses without they had got a sufficiently large administrative area and they could not get any such area in any less district than the county itself. As regarded the details of this Bill it was not necessary to discuss them now, but a great many changes were necessary. He wanted the county to have more power, and the fault of this Bill was the attempt it made to maintain the power of existing petty sessional areas. He thought the county authority ought to have power to draw up a county scheme in order to readjust licences according to the ratio between public-houses and population in all parts of the county. He believed it would be found that the fault of this Bill was not that it gave the county authority too great a power, but not sufficient power to get rid of any evils existing within its area. What was the present position as to the discretion in the petty sessional area? It could be overruled by quarter sessions. Most magistrates who had had great experience in quarter sessions would agree with him when he said that they required for the proper administration of this Bill within the county area more power than was proposed, and they must have power to act on their own initiative and declare that what they did might be applicable to the county at large. He did not believe that any hon. Member who had had any experience in this matter would deny that it was necessary to have a county authority and that it ought to be autonomous.

With regard to compensation the objection taken to it was that it was said to create for the first time a vested interest in licences which had been granted. That expression required analysis in order to see whether it was accurate or not. What did the Bill propose? He was not prepared to go beyond the recognised compensation principle, and if it could be shown that the Bill went further he hoped it would be altered in order to bring it in conformity with the general principle, whether applicable to licences or any other form of property. What was the principle put into force every day? They compensated a man when his licence was taken, not on the basis that he had a vested freehold interest—that was never done—but he was compensated on the basis that the interest he had would probably not be interfered with. As he understood it that was exactly what the Bill proposed. The publican or the licence-holder was not to gain a new title to that which he held at present, and he was not to be given a greater interest. He was not to be compensated as though he had a greater interest than he possessed at the present time, but he was simply to be indemnified. At the present moment his interest was rated, it was assessed for the death duties and the income-tax, and considered in every compensation case when licensed premises were taken away owing to the requirements of public or social policy. That was a proper principle, for whenever they interfered with any individual either in regard to his property or his livelihood; whenever they interfered with the owner of property the principle of indemnity had always been adopted, and it ought to be adopted in this case. The principle was that the person interfered with should not be in a worse condition because he was going to be interfered with on grounds of public policy. It was stated on the face of the Bill that no licenced holder or no licensee was to have a greater interest for the purposes of compensation than if this Bill had not been passed. He did not want to go into detail, but he would challenge any one on either side of the House to show that that was not a proper principle which had been recognised in all other cases, and therefore he could not understand why it should be looked upon in this case as unfair and unjust or as giving to the publican or licensee anything which he was not entitled to. There was one other matter as regarded compensation to which he desired to allude. If temperance reformers in this country shut their eyes to that claim, then they would have no temperance reform at all. However anxious they might be about temperance reform, the supporters of this Bill were just as anxious for the fair claim of justice, because if they disregarded it in one case it was very likely that it would be establishing a bad precedent. Whatever might be said as regarded intemperance, the Government was likely to suffer even more if it disregarded the ordinary and primary principles of justice which must be applied in this, as in all other cases.

He would now deal with objections which had been taken in the exaggerated pamphlet sent out by Mr. Arthur Chamberlain. He said that this Bill proposed to take property which otherwise might be taxed for Imperial purposes, or in other words, it anticipated something which might have under ordinary circumstances gone to the Exchequer. There was an absolute answer to any such suggestion. Of course it was true that all property in this country was capable of being taken for the purpose of national taxation. The real question always was whether that form of property could justly be taken, having regard to existing conditions, for the purposes of the Imperial or National Exchequer. Let them apply that argument to the present Bill. If the licence-holders were not taxed fairly he admitted that the case would be made out as had been suggested on the other side of the House, but could such a case be made good for a moment? Were the brewers and the licence-holders not bearing their fair share of taxation now? Was it not certain that the additional charge now being put upon them was a charge that they could not be legitimately asked to bear for the purposes of the National Exchequer? It was a special charge which they would not have been under except to provide the compensation fund which was necessary under this Bill. Prejudice entered very largely in cases of this sort, but surely it was excess of prejudice to say that the funds which were being provided under this Bill were not being provided by the trade, but were being provided from a source which under other conditions would bring in revenue to the National Exchequer. Upon that point there was just a further illustration he would give. It was suggested in Mr. Arthur Chamberlain's pamphlet that the amount of compensation was so small that they would not gain any real measure of temperance reform. That was arrived at by the suggestion that this Bill appreciated the value of existing licences from about £3,000,000 to £6,000,000. This was an absurd estimate. The pamphlet he had alluded to said there would only be a reduction in Birmingham of seven licences in a year if they took the average value. They should remember that it would be chiefly the poor miserable class of public-houses that would have to be compensated on the present Bill, and this class of public-house in Manchester was one of the primary sources of the evil of intemperance. Did anyone who had dealt with this matter practically in his own district, and who considered the claims of temperance on one side and the claims of justice on the other, imagine for a moment that the value of these public-houses, which ought to be suppressed, would be anything like the average value which had been stated, which included large hotels which were not likely to be affected by a Bill of this kind? The view of temperance reformers generally was that something like a quarter of the existing public-houses ought to be suppressed. He wished to point out that public-houses which would be suppressed would in the main be the quarter of the least value. They would consist of those houses which would be shut up on account of structural unfitness. The 1869 beer-houses would be brought in. In the cases where they wanted this Bill most the value of these particular houses was infinitesimal compared with the better and larger houses which no one wished to interfere with at all. How could they take an average of them and apply that to the extent to which temperance reform might be carried under this Bill? It was a matter of statistics in each case. If this Bill was properly administered, and if the public-houses which really ought to be suppressed were suppressed, without prejudice, where they were too numerous, this Bill would be sufficient to initiate a true temperance reform which he himself desired as much as anyone on the other side of the House.

There was another matter on which he desired to say a word—the question of the time limit. It seemed to him that such a limit would be adverse to the true interests of temperance, and that it could only be introduced in order to prevent the fair working of the Bill itself. Suppose they had a time limit of ten, fifteen, or twenty years, which he understood was the proposal connected with the name of the hon. Member for the Spen Valley Division, and that after such period they were going to tax all existing public-houses up to the full value. The hon. Member's theory was that they should have no compensatory value left in the hands of the licensee at all. That, as he understood it, was the true meaning of the time limit in the opinion of temperance reformers. It would be grossly unjust. There was no more reason to tax public-houses up to their full value than if they went to Regent Street or Bond Street and taxed business premises there up to the full value.

*MR. WHITTAKER (Yorkshire, W.R., Spen Valley): Is it freehold?

*MR. CRIPPS said no one had ever heard of goodwill being freehold. But a public-house had the value arising from the probability of continuance of trade. If there was a limit of ten, fifteen, or twenty years, without any such compensation as he had referred to then this whole question would be raised again at the end of the period. He did not wish to be a prophet, because he knew that prophets often failed, but he should like to say that he did not think anything could be introduced more likely to wreck the whole benefit of the Bill than a time limit. They would get two results from it. They would get people trying to hang on and wait until the end of the period, and on the other hand the moment they introduced a time limit they necessarily diminished the corresponding amount of the funds with which they had to deal in order to bring about a measure of temperance reform, and administrative authorities would be seriously crippled in carrying out their duties in decreasing the number of public-houses where they were not wanted. This might be a good or a bad Bill, but if it was a good Bill they should not introduce a crippling condition by applying a time limit. Let them give their weight and authority to having it passed in the best practical form and not in a maimed form which would do harm to the temperance cause. After all, this Bill was a simple one framed on business lines. It might, of course, be possible to say that the trade should insure its own business. He admitted that that was possible, but if they wanted to press forward the cause of temperance they wanted more than a system of that kind. They wanted a system which would reconcile justice with the cause of temperance reform. He hoped this Bill would receive the assent of the Members of the House, and that this question would not be for ever delayed because certain temperance reformers sought to go too far and give the go-by to principles which must be maintained.

MR. WHITTAKER said the noble Lord the Member for South Birmingham did him the honour of referring to some statements he had made with reference to compensation, and challenged him to state whether he still adhered to them. The Prime Minister said the other day that those who were not prepared to accept the compensation proposals of the Government desired to hunt the publicans like wild beasts. He was one of those who signed the Minority Report of the Royal Commission which recommended a scheme of compensation. It recommended a scheme of compensation not as a legal right, but as a matter of grace and expediency under well defined conditions, and to contend that because they made a recommendation of that kind they ought to accept a proposal for compensation of any kind, shape, or form, however ridiculous it might be, was an argument which did not seem worthy of this House. One of the conditions on which compensation was recommended in the Minority Report was that a large and immediate reduction in the number of public-houses should be secured; another was that it should be merely a temporary arrangement to overcome a temporary difficulty; another was that it should extend the discretion of the justices absolutely to every class of licence; another was that it should be carefully contrived so that it could create no vested interest whatever; and last of all it was to clear the way to effective measures of temperance reform. This Bill violated every one of these conditions. Talk about hunting the publicans like wild beasts! Temperance reformers had no hatred of the publican. They detested his trade. He would rather break stones on the high road than derive his income from that trade. They wanted to reduce the facilities for drinking and to diminish drinking in the land. He for one was willing to ease the way to that reform, but they must have the reform. He went further and said he would give much to get a settlement of this question, but this Bill would not settle it. The only thing properly clear about this Bill was that it would settle nothing, and it would cause a clear and settled determination to reverse it.

The hon. and learned Member for the Stretford Division told them that the licence-holder should be indemnified. He was indemnified now by the monopoly he had enjoyed. He got a privilege which thousands of his fellow-citizens would like. He had a special privilege at the expense of the rest of the community which were debarred from it. When he got that privilege granted to him he knew the conditions under which it was granted. He knew that he was liable to lose it at the end of any year, and knowing those conditions there could be no wrong or injustice when they were fulfilled, and it was taken from him. Every man in the trade knew that when he went into it, and he stayed in it with a full knowledge of the law and of the risk. A vast majority of them had gone into the trade since the law became notorious, and those who went in before had remained in it with the knowledge that they could be got out during the last sixteen years. They had deliberately stayed in, knowing the risk, and they had made enormous profits. If out of these profits they had not written down the value of a precarious security they ought to have done so. If they had not provided a depreciation and reserve fund they ought to have done so. If they had not done it they had put the money into their pockets. When they were considering the reductions made in licences in 1903, it should be remembered that throughout the country there were no brewster sessions in 1902, and therefore these reductions practically covered two years. That was his point. If they took the average from that point of view the number of licences refused renewal in the first instance by brewster sessions before the Royal Commission was 331 per annum, and since the Royal Commission, for the years for which they had returns, the average was 221. Only two-thirds as many had been refused renewal in the first instance as before, and therefore there was no case whatever in the contention that the magistrates had acted in any way recklessly or harshly, or as a matter of surprise.

One of the conditions specified was that under any scheme of compensation there should be a large and immediate reduction in the number of public-houses. Under the scheme now proposed no reduction whatever was certain. None was assured. None was compulsory. The maximum levy was only to be about 1 per cent. on the capital value of the licences of the country, and the maximum levy could only be raised if every quarter sessions every year raised the full amount. Did a single Member of the House believe that every quarter sessions every year could raise the full amount? No, nothing of the kind! If they excluded county boroughs and took county areas alone, there were 900 licensing areas or divisions. From the Government Returns he found that the amount available in those 900 districts would give £605 per year per licence. He was disposed to take the low value on the licence that would be taken away. He believed that it would be the smallest and least valuable of the licences that would be abolished; and it would give £605 per annum in each licensed area—a miserably small amount. He would give one or two more illustrations of what could be done in the county and licensing areas. Those who knew the city of Leeds were aware that it was not without an ample supply of public-houses; but under this Bill, assuming that in Sheffield the average value of the licences abolished was £1,000—and he thought that was an excessive value—he might state that under the reduction scheme at Birmingham, where the brewers bought up the licences under a scheme of their own—they valued them, on the average, at £1,000—the Licence Assurance Corporation had occasionally in their reports given particulars of the amount of licences lost and the amount assured, and they had worked it out at £10,000. Well now, it would take Sheffield twenty-seven years under this Bill to bring its licences down to the same proportion to the population as that which existed in Leeds, and it would take Sheffield thirty-two years to bring down their licences to the proportion which obtained in London. It would take Swansea to bring down the proportion of licences to the level of Cardiff twenty-five years. Brighton had at present 605 licences. If Brighton were licensed as London was, it would have 210 licences. He was aware that Brighton was a pleasure resort. So was London, to which people swarmed from all parts of the world. If Brighton abolished licences worth £1,000 it would take that town forty-two years to abolish the licences, and if the licences were worth £750 it would take thirty-two years. Norwich had 579 on-licences. If that city was as London, it would have 186; and if these were worth £1,000, it would take more than ninety years to get down to the level of London. And this was said to be a great scheme of temperance reform! Again, take the county of Huntingdonshire. Under this scheme there would be £993 a year to deal with. That being a county, he would put the value of a licence at £500. He supposed that one licence for every 300 of the population was sufficient. There were plenty of counties in England and Wales where the proportion was less. But it would take that county 165 years to bring the licences down to the level of 300 of the population. And if the licences were worth only £250, which was a very modest figure, it would take eighty-two years to bring the county down to the level of London. The President of the Local Government Board was not in the House. Had the right hon. Gentlemen been there, he might have been interested in the figures for Wiltshire. In that county £6,000 would be available for division amongst nineteen licensing divisions. If the worth of each licence was £300 each, what prospect was there of getting rid of any number of licences? And it must be remembered that these figures depended upon the maximum power being used each year. The licences to be got rid of under the scheme of the Bill by compensation would not be additional to the number got rid of at the present time. A great many—one-third—got rid of would come under the compensation scheme as "not required"; one third as "not required, and for other reasons"; and the remainder because the charge against them was flagrant and persistent misconduct. The tendency would always be to put even these under the compensation scheme. Therefore, unless the fund was very ample they would not get rid of any more licences than at the present time.

The Prime Minister referred to the action of the temperance party, and not of the temperance party alone but of the majority of the people in this country, in 1888 and 1890. The right hon. Gentleman spoke as if they had lost something by that action. He ventured to say that they had done a great deal better without those Bills of 1888 and 1890 than they could have done with them. Any one who viewed the facts of the case could demonstrate that they had got rid, through the action of the justices, of vastly more licences than could have been accomplished under those Bills. Those measures would have stopped a large ratio of reduction which the magistrates had made; and, moreover, the Bills would not have supplied sufficient funds to have secured the reduction of a greater number. He maintained that the scale of levy on the trade for compensation under the present Bill was altogether inequitable. The levy bore no proportion to the compensation that was to be paid to the houses that were to be abolished. The lowest percentage was to be paid by the smallest and least reputable beershops and public-houses in the back slums and by the flaring gin-palaces. The largest percentage was to be paid by the medium houses. He thought that attention ought to be called to the fact that this was an alteration that had been largely made since the Bill was described to the House by the Home Secretary.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's) said he would explain that presently. The hon. Member was entirely wrong.

MR. WHITTAKER said that he was entirely right, and for this reason. The right hon. Gentleman then explained that the levy to be raised would be £1 for a house of £15 and £2 for a house of £20. Therefore the percentage was not now increased at the lower end. And the percentage had been reduced in the largest houses. As the total sum to be raised was to be the same, therefore it had to be made up on the medium houses. He would give an illustration of how the thing worked. One house valued at £50 was to pay £15, or 30 per cent. on the value. Four houses valued at £12 10s. each a year would pay £4 each, or 8 per cent. Ten houses of the value of £50 a year each would pay £150. One house of the value of £500 would pay £60. One hundred houses valued at £50 each £1,500 a year; one house worth £5,000 would pay £100. That showed that the medium house was to pay most. If there was a genuine publican—a man trading in his own right, the medium man—he would have to pay most. and this was the Government which talked about hunting the publicans like wild beasts! They were protecting the big brewers, which meant the small beer-houses and the big licensed houses which had got the capital to enlarge their premises—and these were the houses which were to pay little. No, it was not the temperance party that was hunting the publicans like wild beasts! Further, the publican who was to contribute to this levy was not to get one farthing of compensation. This Bill did not provide a farthing for the tenant. Under the most favourable considerations the tenant was to pay one-fourth of the levy, but he would have to pay the whole of it. In many cases he was to be allowed to deduct it from his landlord under contract; but the poor fellow would find he had contracted himself out of the possibility of making his living. Before the Royal Commission they were told by a man from Hull that some of them were tied to the brewers for everything but the sawdust. A man who had to enter into bargains of that kind was necessarily not in a position to defend himself against contracts with his superior. What, then, apart from the question of contract, was the money to be paid for? It was to be compensation for the difference of the value of the house with or without a licence. But that was the landlord's interest; the tenant was not in it at all. The amount that was available for compensation must, therefore, all go to the landlord; the tenant would not get a halfpenny. The tenant had no interest in the licensed premises in that sense at all; and unless he held a lease of a house which had increased in value he would not receive one half-penny. Hunting the publican like a wild beast indeed! Then the compensation was to be perpetual, whereas the recommendation in the Report of the Licensing Commission was that it should be a temporary expedient to meet a temporary difficulty. They had always contended that the levy should depend on the reduction, and not the reduction on the levy. The only way in which they could maintain the absolute freedom of the justices and uphold their discretion was to allow their power to reduce licences to remain if they so desired; and if compensation was to be provided it should only be provided for such reduction as they determined. This Bill proceeded the other way. A maximum was given, and within that limit the reduction should be confined.

The Prime Minister stated that an unlimited reduction without an unlimited levy was against the laws of arithmetic. He ventured to suggest that the right hon. Gentleman was not an authority on arithmetic. He and many others could suggest to the right hon. Gentleman a method by which that could be easily managed. Mr. Edward North Buxton, who was an eminent representative of the trade, was examined before the Commission, and when he was asked what the effect of additional taxation on the trade would be, he said that it would have to be got out of the public one way or the other. A year ago the *Morning Advertiser* stated that no doubt there was more than one way of taxing a trade, but that it was obvious to anyone that it was the persons who consumed the commodity in which the taxed trade dealt that would ultimately have to pay. If, therefore, there was to be a tax on the trade, the *Morning Advertiser* added, the only question was, what would be the fairest way of apportioning it, and what would be the easiest way of levying it. That was all the trade cared about; and, therefore, they need not trouble about the trade not being in a position to afford to pay, because according to their own statement they did not mean to pay anything. But supposing the trade did pay they would save all they paid at present for insurance, and also the money they put aside for depreciation and sinking fund. Those were not small items. Many estimates as to the value of licences had been made; but he went carefully into what he regarded as a very moderate estimate. He estimated that the market value of the on-licences in England and Wales was £125,000,000. The insurance premium ranged from 5s. per cent. to 25s. per cent. and taking an average of 10s. per cent. that would amount to £625,000, and if an average of 15s. per cent. were taken that would amount to £937,500. He did not believe the levy would ever amount to more than that. The total amount was to be £1,200,000; but the full amount would never be levied in any particular year; and, therefore, the maximum would probably be from £700,000 to £800,000, which would be about equal to the cost of insurance which would be saved to the trade if they provided a compensation fund. Therefore, nothing would be taken out of the pocket of the trade.

His next point was that the remaining houses would be enormously increased in value. They would be more valuable because they would be more profitable. One of the contentions of the trade was that the amount of drinking did not depend on the number of houses; and that if the houses were reduced in number the amount of drinking would not be correspondingly reduced. If that were so, the same trade would be done by a smaller number of houses at much less expense and with vastly greater profit. Indeed, this Bill would be forcing on the trade what would be a very profitable transaction. There was not the slightest doubt that in almost every town in the country the trade would willingly agree to reduce the number of houses if they could come to an equitable arrangement among themselves. That was the difficulty which confronted the trade, but the Bill would remove it for them and would add enormously to the value of the remaining houses. In any event, whether the reduction in the number of houses reduced drinking or not, and he believed it would, it would not reduce drinking in proportion to the reduction. Comparing the period from 1883 to 1903, he found that the on-licences in England and Wales had in proportion to the population declined 30 per cent., but the amount of beer sold averaged 50 per cent. more per house. The number of houses were reduced, but the average quantity of liquor sold had enormously increased; and the houses wer in consequence vastly more profitable. The Bill would save the trade their insurance money and also their depreciation fund. It would enormously increase the value of the remaining houses, and, according to the trade themselves, they were going to get the cost out of the people. Once or twice he had reminded the House that the brewing trade of this country was now paying only a little more than a third of the taxation that beer paid in the first thirty years of the last century. During that period, the taxation on beer and malt averaged from 14s. to 20s. per barrel. The 10s. duty on beer was dropped in 1830; and the tax was now only 7s. 9d. as compared with from 14s. to 20s.; and, moreover, the price of the grain used in making beer was vastly lower. The process of manufacture had been scientifically improved, so that the brewers now produced five barrels where they only previously produced four. The liquor cost enormously less to make, and it paid less duty, and in truth the trade could afford to pay anything put upon them. It was the enormous profits which resulted from the making of beer that enabled the brewers to pay the fabulous prices they did for public-houses.

The compensation part of the Bill was bad; but that part of it which interfered with the discretion of the justices was worse. It was intolerable and indefensible, and a gratuitous and ignominious surrender to the trade. The Bill seemed to proceed on the presumption that when a system of compensation was to be provided for the trade that the trade was making some concession to the nation. But the only justification there could be for compensation in any shape or form was that it should reduce licences, and accomplish a really substantial measure of temperance reform. But this Bill slammed the door against reform and locked it. It flouted and defied every phase of the temperance movement. The whole scheme smacked of the brewery. They would be told it would make no difference in the practicable administration of the law, but the quarter sessions were to be exalted and glorified while the local justices were to be humiliated. In 1894 sixteen licences were abolished in Sheffield, and in each case there was an appeal and in fourteen cases the licence was reinstated. After those appeals had been held Mr. Dearman, the chairman of the Licensing Bench, said—

> "I have consulted a great many of my colleagues in the borough, and they all think it is really time to alter the law with regard to these appeals."

The whole meaning of that observation was that an authority without local knowledge, local interest, and local information, was not a body to sit in appeal on local questions. In the Royal Commission the Court of quarter sessions was scarcely supported by a single witness outside the trade witnesses. Both the Majority and the Minority Reports recommended a very material modification of the licensing authority. The Majority Report proposed to popularise the local authority; they proposed that the local authorities of all boroughs and county divisions should consist of two-thirds nominated by the justices, and one-third nominated by the county council, and that the appeals should be to the county and borough justices. The borough justices were to be put in in case of appeal in the boroughs. It was their idea to increase the local interest. The Minority Report recommended that the licensing authority should consist half of justices and half of borough or county councillors, and that the appeals should be to similar bodies similarly constituted. Under this Bill neither quarter sessions nor any other body could move until the local authority recommended. The quarter sessions had been a greater millstone, a greater obstacle in the way of licensing reform in the county divisions than in any other part. The Return presented the other day showed the reversal of decisions, reinstatements where the licences had been refused, and renewals by the county licensing divisions in vastly more cases than in the county and municipal boroughs. In the Scotch Act of last year the local justices of the peace were put on to the appeal body, and carefully put on to the licensing authority. Why had there been a change in this case? Why had there been this utter reversal of the policy last year pursued with regard to Scotland? It was one of the accidents of licensing legislation that we should get nearer to the local body. Why this change? It was in order that the local authority should be fettered and impeded in its decisions. In the case of the 250 municipal boroughs, there was no reason for it. In those 250 boroughs there were 20,643 licenees of all kinds, and of those fifty-nine were refused in eight years, on the ground that they were not required. Fifty-nine!

out of 20,643! One out of every 2,800 in each year! One in every thirty-four boroughs! What case was there for taking their authority out of the hands of those boroughs? On the contrary, they ought to be relieved altogether from the authority of quarter sessions and put in the same position only more thoroughly. Instead of that they had been lectured and intimidated, and almost bullied by the Prime Minister for having done that which, as honest men, they were compelled to do, and now they were to be humiliated and degraded. There was not an atom of justification for this proceeding.

With regard to those licences which were to be refused on the ground that they were not required, the local justices were to report, to recommend, to request. They were to be in the same position as an ordinary petitioner before the Court; they were only to ask. There was all the difference in the world between throwing on the Court of quarter sessions the responsibility for reversing the decision of the local authority, and the responsibility of acting on or ignoring a request. Under this Bill if the Court of quarter sessions was willing to refuse the licences they could not act without the money. What were they going to do in Huntingdon with a fund of £999 for the whole county, or in Wiltshire with £305 as the fund at the disposal of the authority. The limitations were all one way. There was no limit whatever to the power of both authorities to do nothing, but there was a very great limitation to their powers of doing anything. They were not stimulated; there was no compulsion, and they had full discretion to do nothing, but when it came to doing anything there were great limitations. The local authority was to recommend, and the Court of quarter sessions might ignore the recommendation and reverse the decision. But even if there were an energetic local authority and Court of quarter sessions, both might be unwilling to move because they had not sufficient money. Then a report was to go to the Court of quarter sessions, but apparently nobody else was to go. The Court of quarter sessions was not to see the witnesses or to hear the evidence, and to his mind when a licence had to be dealt with a very great deal depended not only on the character of the evidence but the way in which it was given. But that was not to be so here. Special arrangements were to be made for the trade, but there was to be no counsel to cross-examine the trade witnesses, and no opportunity given for recalling rebutting evidence. If the local authority and the witnesses disagreed, then this administrative body was to be made a Court. It seemed to him that the process ought to be reversed. The precise duty which was to be taken from the local authority—the refusal of licences on the ground that they were not required—was that which more particularly required local personal knowledge and ought to remain with them. When the Court came to deal with the question of compensation it would not know how much would be required; it would not know what the value was of the licence it was going to refuse. He imagined the value of the licence would be ascertained after it was refused, and therefore the Court would not know how much money it was spending, and in its anxiety to keep within the mark it would refuse still fewer than it otherwise would. Was the full Court of quarter sessions to fix the levy, and if so, were they to fix it before the local justices made their recommendations? If it was to be fixed afterwards the full Bench might so fix the levy that it would be impossible to get rid of the licences. Practically there were to be three tribunals, viz., the local body to recommend, the committee to hear, and the full body to decide whether the necessary money should be provided, and every one would be a hindrance to the getting rid of a licence. In many cases local justices now refused renewals on the grounds of non-requirement, combined with some other reason. The causes of refusal would in future have to be separated, and, whereas the combined grounds made a strong case for refusal, those grounds taken separately would frequently result in the licence being renewed.

Again the tendency was to hinder the reduction of licences. The justices were to give reasons for their decisions. He submitted that the local licensing authority was an administrative body and, as such, was entitled to decide whether a licence was required, not on the evidence alone, but on the evidence and its own judgment combined. There were many reasons justifying the refusal of a licence which could not be put into writing in such a form as would secure conviction in a Court of Law, and this provision would alter for the worse the administration of the licensing law. The importance of the power of the local justices to refuse renewals could not be over-estimated. Local justices frequently granted licences on conditions which they had no means of enforcing other than the threat of non-renewal. Many things took place in connection with the conduct of licensed houses which could not be brought within the offences specified in the Statute, but it was absolutely essential for the good conduct of such houses that the magistrates should have the power of dealing with them. When it was known in a district that the worst managed public-house was likely to lose its licence, it created a competition amongst the houses to avoid being the victim. That stimulus to better management would be removed. The Bill was full of pit-falls, limitations, and restrictions, all of which were in the interests of the trade.

Reference had been made to the exclusion of temperance men from the bench. The House ought to recognise the distinction between opinions and interest. Brewers, publicans, and owners of public-houses were not, as such, prevented from sitting as licensing justices; the disqualification applied only to the area in which their property was situated, and in which, therefore, they had a direct financial interest. Their brewing opinions did not disqualify them from sitting elsewhere. Why, then, should men with views on the other side be disqualified? Every man on the bench who was worth his salt had opinions on this question; some declared they would not refuse licences unless they were enabled to grant compensation, others were in favour of free trade in liquor; all kinds of opinions were held, but no proposal was made to disqualify the holders from sitting on the bench. With regard to interest, there was a clear line of demarcation, but if they attempted to deal with opinions they would venture on treacherous grounds. If temperance men were to be excluded from the bench what was to be said about brewers' solicitors acting as clerks to the magistrates or even sitting on the bench? Several cases of the kind were instanced before the Royal Commission. At a recent meeting of the Holt Brewery Company, as reported in the *Birmingham Daily Post*, after the usual business of moving the adoption of report, a shareholder asked—

> "Why the auditor, who was also a magistrate, should take fees from the company and do nothing to help them?"

Another shareholder in concluding his remarks asked—

> Whether the auditor had sat as a magistrate at the licensing sessions, and whether he had voted in the interests of the company."

In replying the chairman said—

> "As to the auditor's attendances at the magistrates' meetings, he had made inquiries and found that there were four meetings which affected the trade—the auditor did not attend at three—[Cries of "Shame"]—and at the one he did attend the voting was by ballot."

But the auditor was not without a friend, for his partner was at the meeting, and in pleading for his re-appointment said—

> "His partner was strongly opposed to the principle of confiscation as laid down by Mr. Arthur Chamberlain . . . . He knew his partner canvassed people successfully . . . . His partner's sympathies were with them, and anything he could do for them, or in the interests of the trade generally he would certainly do."

Was no objection to be taken to that sort of magistrate? Only last year a Member of this House sat illegally with other magistrates, and, although warned by the Lord Mayor and the justices' clerk, persisted in taking part in the election of the licensing committee. The Attorney-General's attention was called to the matter, but, on the ground that he had received satisfactory assurance that it should not occur again, he declined to prosecute. In the face of these facts, to exclude temperance magistrates would be most unfair; and any such policy if pursued towards one side would have to be applied equally to the other.

The reduction of licences, though desirable, was not a great end in itself; but the power to deal with the licences was of vital importance. The locality ought to have power to issue licences on entirely new conditions or to refuse them altogether at its discretion. This Bill would place an insuperable obstacle in the way of anything of that sort. Freedom should be given to localities to face the national scourge as best they could; until such freedom was given the evil would never be got rid of. Speaking in 1876, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham said—

> "The attempt to deal with this subject for people, and without the people, has been a conspicuous failure. . . . But where statesmen have only made the matter worse, where Parliament has legislated to no purpose, I am still sanguine that the people themselves, if wholly trusted, would do something to mitigate the plague and stay its ravages."

He was well aware that the problem was thorny and difficult; but it was also urgent, imperative, and vital. His objection to the Bill was that it was an altogether retrograde, obstructive, and deplorable measure, which stereotyped and intensified present difficulties, created new obstacles, entrenched the public-house, and endowed the brewer.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. LYTTELTON, Warwick and Leamington): It is a relief that in this matter, at any rate, unlike some others which have been recently before the House, Members on both sides have started from a certain common premiss. We all recognise the vast evils of drunkenness, we all regard the present system as unsatisfactory, and we all wish to do something to remedy the defects which admittedly exist at the present moment. The hon. Member for the Spen Valley, who devoted great care and acumen to the subject, has, like Mr. Arthur Chamberlain, endeavoured to impeach the figures upon which the scheme relies, and pronounced them totally inadequate. Mr. Arthur Chamberlain based his statement on an estimate of the total value of the licences, which he gave as £300,000,000, a sum which even the hon. Member has divided by nearly three. Mr. Arthur Chamberlain then took the amount that would be recoverable by this charge upon the Birmingham licensed premises at £14,000, and it turns out to be £29,000, so that he has multiplied the value of licences by nearly three, while on the other hand, in a city which he is supposed to know he has divided the figure by which the compensation was to be made by two. That is not a very bad beginning for the figures which the hon. Member for Morpeth, with that charm and modesty that always characterises him, has put before us, and which he not unnaturally warns us against being committed to by this Bill. The hon. Member for the Spen Valley took the county of Huntingdon, and showed that the total fund available was only £900. But the hon. Member should not forget that this small sum recoverable by charge for the purposes of contribution showed that there must be very few public-houses in Huntingdon or that they are of small value.

MR. WHITTAKER: The number of public-houses in Huntingdonshire is enormous.

*MR. LYTTELTON: The basis of the hon. Member's figures is £1,000 in the towns and £600 in the country. The hon. Member is quite wrong, and those figures are far too large. As my hon. friend the Member for Stretford told us in his very able and valuable speech, when you add the 32,000 1869 beer-houses which are brought in under this Bill, the figure of £1,000 in towns is preposterously large. I may say that I am now taking the value and not the number of public-houses. It is impossible for me to go into the figures at length at the present moment, and I can only give the figures which happen to come to my notice. For example, Liverpool estimates that the sum for this contribution will be £35,000 a year, and values the licences likely to be extinguished under the scheme at £500. At that rate they will be able to reduce licences in Liverpool at the rate of 70 per annum under the scheme, in addition to 25 a year which lapse at the present time. There is a report in this morning's newspaper which shows that the reduction which the county of London will be able to make under the scheme is 23 per cent. That is not a very bad result. The result of the present system, speaking broadly, over the length and breadth of the land, is that nothing is done in the way of reduction. I say that deliberately. Though there may be some 300 houses out of 100,000 reduced at the present time, I say that the reduction is absolutely inappreciable in its effect upon the cause of temperance. On the other hand, as giving a general sense of instability and insecurity to the holders of licences whose trade might be ruined in a moment by the caprice of the bench, a serious damage is caused to licensed property, with a consequential effect on the character of the licence-holders.

Then there is the second point which was referred to by the hon. Member for Spen Valley and also by the hon. Member for Morpeth. Both stated that our proposal of a compensation fund hits the middleman, lets off the smallest men and also lets off comparatively the largest men. I do not like to traverse statements which the hon. Member opposite put forward, but I doubt whether the hon. Member is accurate in saying that to the middle class of licensees belong the greater number of free houses. But the hon. Member will not deny that the peril of having their licences dealt with is infinitesimal in the case of large hotels like the Euston, the Paddington, or the Métropole. Those hotels are asked to contribute very largely to the fund for the mutual insurance of their weaker brethren. That is what the scheme comes to. This fund is a mutual insurance fund, and the large hotels pay some thousands a year in some cases to this fund by way of premium, though the risk run by them is infinitesimal. The hon. Member for Spen Valley devoted a very considerable portion of his speech to showing the greater amount of compensation which the licence-holders would get by reason of the undue appreciation which would result in regard to the value of the licence.

Mr. WHITTAKER: What I said was that they would get an increased value to their premises, for they would have a much more profitable business by the reduction of licences and in that way they would get a return for what they paid.

*Mr. LYTTELTON: The hon. Member says they will get an increased value by reason of the extinction of other licences, and he declares that they would be in a position to get better compensation by reason of that. The House should take note of the important clause in the Bill which provides that compensation payable for the extinction of a licence is to be calculated as before the passing of the measure. It should not be forgotten that this moment of time is taken to deal with the principle of compensation, and, therefore, the undue appreciation which will result to the value of the licence feared by the hon. Member seems to me to be unfounded.

I will deal rapidly with the hon. Member's last point with regard to the alteration proposed in reference to the jurisdiction exercised by the local justices. The hon. Member said that it was an insult to the justices of petty sessions that quarter sessions should now decline that which the local magistrates asked, instead of reversing that which the local magistrates now decided. What an extraordinary complaint. If the hon. Member and four of his colleagues were to sit and adjudicate upon a matter and arrive at a decision and I were to reverse it, I think they would have very good reason to complain, and much more reason to feel hurt than if they had asked me for something and I had declined it. That is the exact situation. At present justices sit in brewster sessions, and quarter sessions may reverse their decisions. In future, quarter sessions are to have the benefit of the views of local justices, and they may in exceptional circumstances decline to follow what they say. As has already been pointed out, in only seven cases have decisions been reversed out of 250. If that is so on the much more important issues, and if they are allowed to decide whether a licence shall go without compensation or not, that is a serious matter. Their function in the future under this Bill will be merely to decide whether a certain house is unnecessary, and whether it shall be extinguished with compensation. The hon. Member for Stretford said that the aggregate of quarter sessions is a far better tribunal to decide these questions of refusal and compensation. Why? Because they are all human, and when they meet the village publican out shooting, at a cricket match, at a harvest home, or among other incidents of village life, it is a disagreeable thing for those who sit in petty sessions and know the man to take away his licence and seriously to damage him in his business. Nothing could be more disagreeable, and justices constantly shrink from the duty. But when it is necessary to undertake this work, is it not better that the point should be decided on facts presented to quarter sessions by the local justices, and after a separate and independent investigation on the part of quarter sessions instead of by the local justices? Is it not much better that they should decide that point than that local gentlemen should do so? I quite agree with the point that the knowledge of the local magistrates may be more intimate, but I venture to think that their natural human prejudices are more likely to operate than in the case of a remoter body. I might incidentally say that a large portion of British justice is founded on the desirability of taking jurisdiction away from a local district instead of having it actually resident. I ventured to say at the beginning of my observations that the present system is indefensible, that it gives no guarantee that the worst houses should go, or that the best should stay. Its effect is inappreciable on temperance, but damaging to the principles of natural equity and justice. And why is this? I beg hon. Gentlemen interested in temperance, who, perhaps, have not seen as much of this as I have, to think of the dilemma justices are in at the present moment. They have to say on their consciences that public-houses are or are not wanted. They can see perfectly well that a house is not wanted for the purposes of a district, but they have to ask themselves, "Shall we take it away without compensation?" That is the problem. Is it surprising for the moment that in hundreds and hundreds of cases where a licence ought to be extinguished because it is not required in a district, the magistrates, being kindly, honest, and just men, shrink from inflicting so grievous a wrong.

Just permit me for a moment to trace the thing back. The predecessors of the justices are responsible for the very excess which it is now desired to reduce. They themselves granted the licences that are now superfluous and which make areas congested with public-houses. And against whose opposition have they granted them? First, always let it be said, against the opposition of temperance people, but next, and less vehemently expressed, against the opposition of the licence-holders at the time. Of course, they did not wish to be competed with. They opposed in every case. Who ever heard of a new licence being applied for which was not strenuously opposed by all the publicans in the neighbourhood? The old public-houses are just those which ought to be extinguished. These houses existed fifty or sixty years ago, and the owners are the very people who opposed the new licences that made the district congested. The congestion which the owners of these very public-houses resisted is now to be made the occasion of taking away the property to which they have a right, and which they have never forfeited by bad conduct. I ask any fair man if that argument alone were put to him sitting on a bench, and if he had not been committed by previously expressed views on the subject, whether he would not think that sufficient to establish the hardship of the case. Hon. Gentlemen who have studied the subject are aware that the matter does not stop there. The State rates and taxes, licences, and assesses them for death duties. In other words, when it suits the pecuniary interest of the State it is assumed that the licence has a permanent value. The instructions issued by the Inland Revenue on the subject, and signed by Sir Algernon West, are as follows—

> "Death of lease-holder publican. In each of these cases it is assumed that the licence will continue to be renewed."

But when the question to be considered is whether the licence should be extinguished the State is, according to hon. Gentlemen, to say that the licence has no permanent value. I ask what view would humble ordinary folk take of a Government which said: "In assessing for taxation I treat you as a permanency, but for the purpose of abolishing you I treat you as a phantom?" The gross injustice of such a position would not be exhausted even then. Assume the case of a young man succeeding to a public-house that had been in his family for years, and paying death duties on the succession. Assume that the licence is then extinguished, and that in the same town a number of other public-houses are pulled down for some street improvement.

Those houses would be legally compensated on the basis of thirteen or fourteen years purchase; but the young man who had paid death duties and whose licence was taken away for the same reasons of public expediency would get nothing. I take one more illustration, because it is stronger still. There is the case of the unfortunate man who for many years has conducted his house well under the most rigorous licensing law with heavy penalties in every direction, and whose licence is suddenly taken away without compensation, while in the same neighbourhood public-houses demolished in the clearing of an insanitary area are awarded full compensation. I venture to think that the Government that permits such a state of things to continue, desolating to the cause of temperance, and still more desolating to the cause of justice, would be unworthy of itself. Yet all the strongest Governments of the last thirty years have failed in the endeavour to deal with this question, because they have not recognised what Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Bruce, Lord Derby, and the right hon. Member for Montrose have all recognised.

"I strongly oppose any legislation"

—the right hon. Member for Montrose has said

"which would overlook the fact t at immense capital has been embarked in your trade in the ordinary expectation that the trade would not be interfered with."

That principle, admitted by all great Liberals of the last thirty years, a principle perfectly sound, is affirmed by the almost uniform practice of the tribunals dealing with the matter, by the law of compensation since 1845, and by the law of taxation on which the Inland Revenue authorities act, and is consonant with the ideas of every fair-minded man in the community.

I assert, on this very hastily outlined sketch of the subject, if anybody is not convinced by these arguments that compensation is a sound principle he is not capable of being convinced at all. Really the crucial point in the Bill is whether the method of awarding compensation prescribed in the Bill is the right method. It is not just or right to say that it creates a vested interest. For forty years this so-called creation has existed. [Cries of "No."] The House of Lords described the interest as terminable in "Sharp against Wakefield," but that decision does not exhaust the law on the subject. Other branches of the law have affirmed over and over again that that which the House of Lords called a terminable interest is a valuable interest. [An HON. MEMBER: No.] Yes, it has. I will not give cases in this House, but I can assure the hon. Gentleman, and I will satisfy him afterwards, that from the Master of the Rolls forty years ago to the present Master of the Rolls that principle has been affirmed, and those tribunals which have assessed compensation upon twelve, thirteen, or fourteen years purchase have been affirmed. It may well be that the law describes this as a terminable interest, but that is not really *ad rem.* The point is that the law says it is a valuable interest; the law has said it a dozen times. Before this Bill was brought forward, and indeed in the time of the First Reading, it became pretty obvious from the speeches directed, not against the Bill, but against something else, that everybody except extremists on temperance matters — I believe even the hon. Member for Spen Valley, in a public document, said that they were for compensation, but that the compensation should come out of the trade. Now, we have the authority of Mr. Arthur Chamberlain, apparently endorsed by the hon. Member for the Spen Valley, that they are not entitled to take this compensation out of the trade in order to compensate the trade, because what we get from the trade is wealth, and all wealth is taxable; and we must not use for compensation the trade wealth which is available for general taxation. If that means anything, it means that you cannot get any wealth from anyone for the purposes of compensation because all wealth is taxable, and the State must have everything.

MR. WHITTAKER: That was not my argument.

*MR. LYTTELTON: I absolve the hon. Member. It is not his argument. I am afraid that I have identified him with a Birmingham authority.

There is another point which is advanced by people for whom I entertain the sincerest respect. It is that there ought to be a time limit in the Bill. If I understand the argument rightly, it is that you have now to deal with a property which has no permanent value, but that at the end of, say, twenty years, you would still have an excessive number of public-houses which by that time would have had a fair run, and ought then to take their chance, having been granted so considerable a delay. May I venture to say that that is contrary to the scheme of the whole Bill. The scheme of the Bill is that the trade itself should compensate for extinguished licences, and a fund is set up to achieve that object. Translated into insurance language, that means that all the trade compulsorily comes into a scheme of mutual insurance, and for that the members pay considerable premiums every year. Let me give an example. I take a licensed property, freehold, let on ninety-nine years lease to a lessee on a ground rent of, say, £250 a year with a premium of £2,000. This property would pay a considerable tax in order to contribute to the fund which extinguishes licences. Obviously a well-conducted and prosperous house would be unlikely to be interfered with during the twenty years, but after the lapse of that time, and after paying a heavy premium every year, the licence-holder would still run the risk of losing his licence. The only way in which the holder of a long lease in such a case as this could make provision for that risk would be to set up an insurance fund for himself in addition to contributing to the mutual insurance fund. I venture to think that that is not a business proposition. It is not good business, nor is it sound justice. No one who has really considered this subject really anticipates the greatest things from any legislation in the cause of temperance. Legislation can do something; this Bill, I believe, will do something considerable; but I believe myself that the real hope of temperance in this country lies rather in the removal, so far as we can, of the misery to which the hon. Member for Morpeth referred, the misery of the poorer classes, the insanitary condition of their houses, and the too frequent overcrowding, which are the terrible sources of drunkenness. I am for legislation which mitigates those griefs, for administrative action such as that of the London County Council for providing more recreation for the people, more open spaces, and better and more airy houses. From those things which make for a change in the hearts of the people, much more is to be anticipated than from any legislation. But we must do what we can in the way of legislation, and this proposal, which I believe has the assent of all rational temperance reformers, does at least achieve the great object of doing something for temperance without doing it the worst dis-service of identifying it with injustice.

MR. GEORGE WHITE (Norfolk, N.W.) said that the advice given by the hon. Member on the other side to temperance reformers was of such a nature as to make these latter exclaim "Save us from our friends." The noble Lord, in his maiden speech, said that those whom he termed extremists on this question had always been the obstacle to true temperance reform; but he was bound to say that history did not justify that remark. Some extremists regarded this Bill as retrograde. His opinion was that the Bill was unique in its character in the history of the Mother of Parliaments. They had had legislation for centuries in the House of Commons in regard to licensing questions, and that legislation had always treated this trade as a dangerous trade, which must necessarily be curtailed in the interests of the people. Never before in history had a Bill been introduced solely in the interests of the trade; and he insisted that the Bill from beginning to end was a measure to conserve the interests of the trade. There was not a word in it about the needs of the people in regard to temperance reform. The Prime Minister had spoken of it as a temperance reform Bill, but he thought the right hon. Gentleman had said that in the same sense as he had declared the Education Bill to be an education reform Bill. He ventured to say with all reverence that the Bill might fitly be described as doing those things that ought not to be done, and leaving undone those things which ought to be done. It was a much worse Bill than that designed by the Majority Report of the Royal Commission. There were many defects in that Majority Report which were remedied by the Minority Report; but even a Bill framed on the lines of the Majority Report would have been better than this Bill, and more acceptable to those interested in social reform. It served the interests of the trade, which needed no protection whatever.

The question was asked why they shoud touch this subject at all; but the answer was found in the position the trade assumed after the legislation of 1902. That legislation did undoubtedly to a certain extent reduce drinking and it did a much more important thing, it quickened the magistrates throughout the country in regard to the evils of drinking, in the way of reducing drinking facilities. Then the trade came and set its foot down and declared that it would stand it no longer; and just as 120 free-trade Conservatives frightened the Prime Minister, on the occasion of a celebrated Amendment, so the trade had frightened him. This was really the genesis of the Bill. The Prime Minister then turned round and called the magistrates ill-names and determined to check their powers for restricting the number of licences, and for what? Simply for doing their duty; simply for taking steps in a limited way to restrict the number of licences because they felt that the results of the present licensing system were so deplorable. After having studied the Bill very carefully, he had come to the conclusion deliberately that it was one made by and for the brewing interest, just as the Education Bill was made by and for the Bishops. The same mistake had been made in framing this Bill as in framing the Education Bill. One side only had been taken into account. He noted the fact that the maximum rate of charge had been reduced, since the Home Secretary introduced the Bill, from £150 to £100, and he asked if this had been done in order to meet a still more pertinacious demand on the part of the brewers.

Reiterating his statement that the Bill was retrograde in character, he maintained that its influence would be most disastrous upon the work of social reformers. He had never entirely rejected the idea of compensation. As a licensing magistrate he quite appreciated the difficulty with regard to the selection of the licences to be reduced, and he was quite free to admit that it would in certain cases facilitate reduction if some principle of compensation were adopted. He should, in fact, be greatly more pleased with the Bill if the fund placed at the disposal of the magistrates was something like adequate; and he proceeded to argue that inasmuch as the suppression of licences would enhance the value of those remaining, the trade could very well afford to pay a much larger sum for compensation. He maintained that the gigantic tied-house system was one of the questions that should be kept prominently before the House, and he described the rateable value as an unfair basis of payment. He argued that the tenant would not get compensation, and he illustrated this point by a reference to Norwich. There, he said, there were nearly 600 licences, and three-fourths of them were in the hands of three or four large brewers. Transfers were numerous and tenants were mostly under a fortnight's or a month's notice. What compensation could such a man claim under this Bill? He was afraid he would get practically none at all. The whole amount would go to the brewers, who, although deprived of one house, would have increased trade at another. The arrangements between the publican and brewer in the Bill were most defective; they invited the owner to press the publican to contract out of any right he might have of sending in a claim under the Bill. He argued that it should be compulsory upon licensing authorities to raise a compensation fund, and he again turned to Norwich to illustrate the effect of the Bill in checking the voluntary surrender of licences. It was admitted that there was a large excess of licences, and, although there had not been a single licence withheld because the needs of the neighbourhood did not require it, there had been a reduction of fifty effected during the last few years. That reduction could go on no longer, because an absolute property would be created in houses such as had been allowed to drop because they were not profitable. By the limited fund proposed it would take from fifty to seventy five years to accomplish such a reduction as was desirable, and he believed this reduction might have been obtained without any compensation. At Norwich the brewers undertook to consider a scheme, and he had no doubt that in five years they would have been able to reduce the number by at least fifty without doing corresponding harm to the trade, but this was absolutely stopped as soon as the Prime Minister uttered the words he did to the deputation which waited upon him. Congested districts where there were excessive licences were being dealt with, and would have been dealt with, but now under this Bill licensed houses would become such valuable property that it would be impossible to do anything that would appreciably affect the drinking habits of the people.

The Bill was a reflection upon the conduct, the prudence, and the judicial character of the magistrates; and it destroyed the value of the personal acquaintance of the licensing magistrates with the needs of the neighbourhood. If they could reduce the drinking habits of their fellow countrymen to the average which now existed in the United States, they would be doing more to benefit the commercial and social life of the community than any tariff reform that could be proposed. He agreed with the Colonial Secretary that they could not rely upon legislation to make the great changes which needed to be brought about in the community; still the House was bound to take such measures as it could to remove the over-numerous temptations to drink, to help the weaker vessels and to give them a chance. If the Bill advanced in the slightest degree the great social reforms which they all desired he would support it, but instead of that it trifled with and hindered the great cause of temperance reform; its root principles were wrong, it aimed at protecting the trade instead of the people; and he should, therefore, feel bound to vote against its Second Reading.

MR. LLOYD WHARTON (Yorkshire, W.R., Ripon) said he would heartily support the Bill, the result of which he believed would be that justice would be done in future in many cases where it was impossible for justice to be done in the past. He wished to regard the Bill from two standpoints, viz., as a member of the Royal Licensing Commission, and also as a justice and chairman of quarter sessions. The Royal Commission recommended a scheme of compensation very much akin to that proposed in the Bill, but he was bound to admit that he preferred the scheme of the Government. Raising money would be a much easier matter under the Bill. The scheme of the Royal Commission was that every house should have a declared value, and should pay a percentage on that value to the county fund. That scheme would raise considerably less than would be raised by the Bill. It had been said that the sum raised by the Bill would be inadequate. He thought not. The sum required was £1,200,000 a year. If they wanted to sweep away all the public-houses in England of course it would be very inadequate, but what reasonable people wished to do was to sweep away those licences which were unnecessary. The measure of necessity was the use of a house. Not so much in the towns but in the country there were plenty that might be got rid of at £100 a-piece. If they averaged the price of removal of these houses at £500 each they would be giving a very generous average. Reckoning on the basis of £1,200,000 a year to deal with, and with an average removal of £500, they would remove 2,400 public-houses a year, or at the end of twenty years 48,000 houses would be suppressed. As there were 112,000 public-houses in England, he thought that the suppression of 48,000 of them in twenty years should satisfy the most greedy and extreme temperance reformer.

It was suggested there hould be a time limit of twenty years. The result of that would be to almost entirely frustrate and abolish the financial basis of the Bill. Take a man who had for twenty years been paying £100 a year, At the end of that time he had paid £2,000. Another man who had a public-house near by at the end of nineteen years lost his license and got full compensation. But the man who had been allowed to hold on for twenty years, and at the end of that period for some reason had his license suppressed, did not get a brass farthing. He did not think the hon. Member would say there was any justice in that. It might be said that the Royal Commission suggested a time limit. That was true, but their proposal was that every seven years the compensation fund should be reviewed, not stopped, because financial considerations might require that a review should be made, and it might be necessary to have further or less borrowing powers.

He did not think they would pass a slur upon the justices by passing this Bill. They were asked to inquire locally, as they were now, and to send up a report to the Court of quarter sessions. The Court of quarter sessions would, he should think, in almost every case be able to agree with them, and so suppress the house concerned. Why had they not done it in the past? From one of the large towns in the county of Durham two cases were sent up on appeal to him as chairman of quarter sessions. One case was that of a publican who was compelled by the justices to spend about £300 upon his premises, and immediately after, for some unknown reason, there being no complaint against the man, the local Bench decided to take away his licence. That decision was reversed on appeal, but had there been power to award compensation it would probably have been upheld. The other case was that of a widow who had had a licence granted to her. She had £1,000 of her own, and she borrowed £1,400, and with this money she set up in the house. Very soon after the house was gutted by fire. She patched up the place as well as she could, and spent all her profits in repairing the ravages of the fire. This went on for two years, and then, when the repairs were nearly finished, the local bench thought fit to refuse the renewal. That decision also was reversed, and he thought they did rightly, though had they had the power of compensation they might have supported the decision of the Court below. He believed the Bill, so far from creating injustice, would enable magistrates to do justice and to remove hardships, and for these reasons he should support the Second Reading.

Mr. ATHERLEY-JONES (Durham, N.W.) said the cases quoted by the right hon. Gentleman were exceptional, and did not afford much assistance. The renewal in the latter of the two cases was refused on the ground of structural defects, and that was one of the conditions under which, even after the present Bill, the licence might be withdrawn without compensation. The Colonial Secretary had used some extraordinary arguments. In connection with the proposed time limit, he had pointed to the hardship that would be suffered by a man who paid to the compensation fund for twenty years, and then had his licence taken without being compensated. Was not the obvious answer that the man had had twenty years protection for his twenty years payments? He had really been insuring himself against accidents. The right hon. Gentleman had also argued that the House was merely following the "Sharp *v.* Wakefield" decision to its logical issue in declaring that the owner of a public-house was a mere licensee in the bare meaning of the word, whereas a Government Department had recognised him as possessing a vested interest by assessing compensation when the property was taken under compulsory powers. No more absurd proposition was ever put before the House. The Department had simply taken things as they found them. They had recognised that the man had, so to speak, a reasonable expectation of life for so many years, and had assessed compensation on that basis. As to the compensation fund, which was alleged to be ample, he had analysed the figures as far as they were available for various countries. In Durham there were about 2,000 public-houses, varying considerably in value, and the total amount available for compensation would be about £25,000 per annum. Such a sum was a mere bagatelle, and in the opinion of persons qualified to speak would do nothing to ameliorate the present state of things. Wales enjoyed an unfavourable pre-eminence in respect to the number of public-houses. In a division of Glamorganshire there were sixty-one public-houses to 6,000 inhabitants. In Prestatyn there was one public-house to every twelve adult persons, whereas in Manchester the proportion was one to 130 persons, and in West Ham one to 355.

Did the right hon. Gentleman really believe that the great evil of intemperance could be removed by such means as this Bill provided? It afforded no remedy by which the evil could be effectively grappled with. The people in the North of England, recognising the great evils which they suffered from the abuse of the public-house system, did not regard this Bill as offering a final solution of the difficulty, or even as going one step in the right direction.

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the debate stood adjourned till this Evening's Sitting.

EVENING SITTING.

MILWR AND DISTRICT MINES DRAINAGE BILL [LORDS] (BY ORDER).

[SECOND READING.]

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Wexford, N.) said he rose for the purpose of moving the rejection of the Bill. He had no personal concern in the matter one way or the other, his action being simply prompted by what he conceived to be the interests of the district. The Bill was opposed by the Holywell District Council, the inhabitants of Holywell, and also by riparian owners of the land and other persons interested in local industries. If passed it would seriously affect the water supply of Holywell, a growing town of 3,000 inhabitants, and the local industries. Any interference with the water supply of such a town must have a very serious effect on its prosperity. It had been suggested that this Bill had been passed by a Committee of the House of Lords, and that therefore this House ought not to oppose it, but, after all, the House of Lords was not always perfect in its judgment, and it was quite possible that in the case of this Bill, as in other matters, the House of Lords had made a mistake. This Bill was promoted by a private company. Some time ago the persons interested in the promotion of this Bill carried out a scheme of mine drainage for the purpose of discovering lead; the scheme was not a success and the object of this Bill was to interest the public in the scheme of working lead mines if they were found to exist, which at present was not the case. His contention was that no one for the purpose of developing lead mines had a right to injure local industries or the water supply of a rising town like Holywell. Under the first scheme no damage had been done, but under this Bill the promoters proposed to extend the present drainage scheme, and by driving tunnels in all directions to tap the limestone area from which the water supply of Holywell was drawn. The scheme was a pure speculation which might or might not result in the discovery of lead, but however it might be they were certain to find water, the draining of which would not only deplete the water supply of Holywell but also seriously affect the source of the Holywell stream, upon which a great many local industries depended. A well-known illustration of what would occur was the Severn Tunnel, which tapped the limestone area, with the result that it drained all the surrounding country within an area of twenty-four miles. This scheme proposed to drain to a depth of 200 feet and within 300 feet of the main source of the Holywell water supply. Anybody acquainted with geology would realise the risks which were run in going so near a limestone area. The hon. Member quoted the evidence given before the House of Lords Committee by geological experts to the effect that this scheme if carried out must lower the level of the water in the Holywell stream and might do so to such an extent as to dry up the spring at St. Winifred's Well altogether.

He asserted that it would affect injuriously seven or eight mills which were dependent on the stream for their power, and that without these mills, which employed large numbers of men living in Holywell to whom many thousands of pounds were paid in wages, Holywell could hardly exist. The effect of this scheme would be even more far-reaching having regard to the fact that one of these mills, which was engaged in chemically treating seaweed, over and above the people it employed in the neighbourhood, employed some 200 people on the coast of Donegal for the collection of the seaweed treated, and that industry might be closed altogether owing to the depletion of the water in Holywell Stream. The hon. Member, in support of his Resolution, drew attention to the fact that in 1885 there was a suggestion to tap the water in St. Winifred's Well for the purpose, not of a private speculation, but of obtaining a water supply for a town, and the result of a local inquiry into the matter had been that the Provisional Order sanctioned by the Local Government Board was cancelled and that scheme was not permitted to proceed. The House was now asked to agree to a proceeding which the Local Government Board had vetoed in 1885. There was every justification for asking the House to reject this Bill, especially having regard to the fact that there was no provision for compensating any industry that might be injured and no provision that any injury done to mill owners or others would be made good.

The House would find precedents for the course he now asked them to take in the case of the Croydon Corporation, which proposed to sink two wells, one at Addington and one at Beddington, to provide a water supply for Croydon, but who were not allowed to do so because the sinking of the well at Beddington would, it was proved, deplete the water of the Wandle and inflict incalculable injury; in the case of the Nottingham Corporation, in which case the opposition of the town of Newark was successful on the ground that if the Nottingham Corporation sank the three wells proposed it would rob Newark of its water supply; and in the case of the Wolverhampton Corporation, whose Bill was thrown out on Second Reading on the ground that the action they proposed to take would injure the water supply of the surrounding districts. He pointed out that in all these cases the Bills were promoted by public corporations for a public purpose ye they were not successful. He therefore submitted that this was a Bill that ought not to be allowed a Second Reading, and he moved that it be read a second time this day six months.

Sir CHARLES McLAREN (Leicestershire, Bosworth) said he supported the Motion of his hon. friend, and, like him, he had no personal interest in the matter. He thought this was one of those Bills which ought to be dealt with by the House on some grounds of definite principle. It was a Bill of an extraordinary character, and unless the House was prepared to lay down some rule to deal with those who wished to suck all the water from the land, large towns would be at the mercy of Promoters of bills whose only object was speculation. This Bill was promoted by a great many landowners, who had, however, limited their liability to a very small amount, and if the Bill were allowed to pass the inhabitants of Holywell would be ruined without any hope of reparation. His hon. friend had stated so fully the specific grounds upon which injury was feared by the inhabitants of Holywell that it was unnecessary to emphasise them. He would, therefore, deal with one point to which his hon. friend had not alluded. St. Winifred's Well was believed by Roman Catholics to have miraculous powers; it was the only well in this country to which pilgrims resorted for the cure of their ailments. Upon this point he had made some inquiries, and had discovered that some 15,000 persons came down every year to bathe in St. Winifred's Well and be cured. From this source the town of Holywell derived a very large amount of revenue, and it was perfectly clear if the water was diverted and the spring dried up it would result in a great loss to the town. One peculiarity of this Bill was that although it proposed to extract the water from the district, the promoters had made no provision of any sort for compensating reservoirs. The peculiarity of this water was that it did not flow on the surface of the ground as was usual in the district, but went down fissures in the limestone strata, and at a certain level the water rose up again in great volumes. It was quite obvious that if tunnels were driven down below the existing stream the subterranean reserves would be drained to such an extent as to make the water flow not in its accustomed channel. If tunnels were driven 200 feet below St. Winifred's Well that might have the effect of drying it up. It had been a law for sixty years that water might be abstracted from underground channels to any extent without paying compensation to neighbours. That was a very hard law in many instances and would be so in this case. The promoters of the Bill were unable to take advantage of the law without coming to this House to get compulsory powers, and he submitted that the House should put upon the promoters the most stringent terms that capital should be found, not only to complete the works, but to provide compensation to the interests of the riparian owners and local industries in the district which might be injured by the abstraction of the water. He believed that if power was given to take the underground water without compensation the town of Holywell would be ruined.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day six months.'"—(*Sir Thomas Esmonde.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

MR. YERBURGH (Chester) said that the particular area which the Bill proposed to deal with in the county of Flint was acknowledged by all experts to be very rich in minerals, and the Bill was promoted on the ground that it might be the means of the development of very valuable industries. He had received a telegram from the town clerk of the borough of Flint, which stated that that evening the town council had adopted a resolution unanimously approving the scheme before the House, on the ground that it would be of great advantage to the district. Some years ago a very valuable mining industry existed there. Many men were employed, a great amount of money was paid in wages, and the district was prosperous. The mines were flooded and the industry could not be carried on for the time. An attempt was made to take the water out of the mines by pumping, but the expense was found to be so great that it was abandoned. In 1875 a company was formed for the purpose of draining the mines on similar principles to those proposed in the Bill for the Milwr district. The same objections were raised against the Bill promoted by that company and the same arguments used as against the present Bill. In spite of the opposition, however, the Act was passed, and none of the prophecies regarding it were fulfilled. The Well of St. Winifred, which was so deservedly esteemed by Roman Catholics, still poured out its waters for the benefit of the pilgrims who visited it, in undiminished volume. He understood that Holywell, which opposed the Bill, did not get the whole of its water supply from this well, but from other wells, and he was informed that the Local Government Board were pressing Holywell to obtain a further supply elsewhere. All the questions raised by the hon. Gentleman opposite were entirely questions for the Committee upstairs. He had studied the case very carefully, and he could see nothing whatever which would weigh in his mind against the scheme proposed in the Bill. The Bill had already been before the House of Lords, who had made exhaustive inquiry, and had met all the objections to it which had been put forward that night. He was prepared to give his hearty support to the Bill.

MR. MOSS (Denbighshire, E.) said he wished to support the Second Reading of the Bill, the objections to which were merely fantastical. It was said that the scheme of the Bill would interfere with the water flowing to St. Winifred's Well, but up to the year 1874 mines were in existence in the neighbourhood of the well, and were worked at a level below the well, yet the flow of water to St. Winifred's remained unaffected. The House was not now competent to examine the details of the Bill. That duty should be left to a Committee.

COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY (Shropshire, Newport) said he had had experience of the objections which might be taken to an interference with an underground supply of water. He held that when there was a conflict of opinion, and a possibility of those who were benefitting by the existing over-ground flow of water being damaged by the diminution of that flow, it was necessary that the promoters of the drainage scheme should give satisfaction that there would be full compensation if any damage resulted Although he was not prepared to go the length of voting against the Second Reading, he reserved to himself full power to oppose it at a subsequent stage, unless the supporters of the Bill would say that in the event of damage happening to the neighbourhood by the abstraction of the underground flow of water, that would be compensated for.

*THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (Mr. J. W. LOWTHER, Cumberland, Penrith) said that if he thought that the effect of the Bill would be to damage the flow of water to St. Winifred's Well or Holywell, he would vote against it and invite the House to do the same. But he had no evidence before him to that effect. His hon. and gallant friend had referred to the question of compensation, but he took it that it would be really impossible to estimate any money compensation to pilgrims and others who might be deprived of the benefit they had derived from the well. It was impossible to measure the many advantages which might be gained, and what he was going to suggest was that a Committee—supposing that the House sent the Bill to a Committee—might easily insert a clause in the Bill to provide compensation water, if the evidence justified them in so doing, and to require that the promoters of the Bill should undertake that so many thousand gallons of water every day, should flow in a particular channel. If some such clause as that were inserted then neither the pilgrims or the mill owners would be in any way injured, but unless they sent the Bill to a Committee it would be impossible to insert any such clause. Seeing that this was really an engineering question, he suggested that the Bill should be read a second time and sent to a Committee upstairs. He thought the House might take it that *primâ facie* the promoters had made out a good case in favour of their Bill, because it had gone through a Committee in another place.

MR. McKEAN (Monaghan, S.) said the Chairman of Committees had told the House that there was no evidence that the proposed scheme would interfere with the flow of water. He thought anyone who was anxious to get evidence on the subject had abundance of it already available. The hon. Member for Chester had stated that the same arguments which were used against this scheme were used years ago against a similar scheme for the drainage of mines in the district, and that the prophecies then indulged in had not been realised. He himself held that every argument used against the former Bill had been absolutely verified by the fact. There was now a diminished flow of water, so that the hon. Member's argument had no foundation in fact at all. The urban district council of Holywell, and the inhabitants of Holywell, had petitioned against this Bill, and the fact that they had done so indicated that they believed they would be damnified by the proposed scheme. The suggestion of the Chairman of Committees that the Bill should be sent to a Committee reminded him of the invitation, "Will you walk into my parlour said the spider to the fly." The district council and the inhabitants of the place knew the merits and demerits of the proposal, and he thought the House would be well advised in going by the opinion of the local people. The fact that the Bill had gone through a Committee of the House of Lords was to him rather an argument against than in favour of it. He would quote to the House the opinion of an undoubted expert, Mr. Joseph Haynes, mining engineer, said that, in his opinion, it was impossible for any of the proposed tunnels to be constructed without artificially lowering, or entirely taking away, the present supply of water used and enjoyed by the inhabitants within the drainage area. He submitted that on purely archæological grounds the scheme ought not to be sanctioned, but St. Winifred's Well had a higher claim to their protection than could be found in archæological reasons. It was a great sanatorium to which people suffering from diseases which had baffled medical science went and were completely cured. The House should not permit this act of twentieth century vandalism.

MR. J. H. LEWIS (Flint Boroughs) stated that a tunnel constructed some four miles from St. Winifred's Well had reduced the flow of water from between six and eight million gallons to about four million gallons a day, and asked what results were likely to follow from the driving of five tunnels, the nearest of which was to approach within one mile of the well itself. He had read with considerable care the evidence given before the Lords Committee, and he had tried to form a perfectly impartial judgment upon it. He was afraid that the suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman in this particular instance as to providing compensation water was impracticable. If the Bill could be carried without any possibility of doing harm to St. Winifred's Well, and if the industries on the stream and the interests of the people employed there could be safeguarded, he should not have the slightest hesitation in voting for the Bill. He frankly admitted that the scheme would increase the amount of employment. The question to be considered was, were these benefits to be obtained by sacrificing those interests which have been in existence for 100 years? They depended on a cheap water supply, but for that they would have ceased to exist long ago. They had a right to some consideration at the hands of the House, and he hoped that in trying to do good to one part of the district they would not do harm to another. His position in the matter was one of extreme difficulty. He had been for nineteen year associated with works on the stream, and that being so, he would not vote one way or another.

***Sir JOHN ROLLESTON** (Leicester) said the merits and demerits of the Bill could only be decided in the usual way, by formal and responsible evidence given before a Committee. Those opposed to the Bill asked the House to cut short at this stage of its career a measure ostensibly for the development of a new district, and the employment in new industries of a large number of people. He submitted that the House should not accept that responsibility without formal inquiry for which the machinery of a Committee-room gave ample opportunity. There the promoters and objectors could meet face to face and state their views by means of sworn evidence, and a Committee hearing statements of such an intricate and technical character in this way must surely be a more competent and judicial tribunal than that House could possibly be, depending as it must do on what might be, after all, but loose and irresponsible statements made in the course of a Second Reading debate. He himself could not come to a decision on a matter of this kind without formal and fuller inquiry. He therefore hoped that the Bill would be sent to a Committee.

***Mr. TOMKINSON** (Cheshire, Crewe) said the flow of the water in this stream had suddenly reverted to what it was formerly. That was in consequence of the wet year. There had been a deficiency of rainfall during the past twenty years, and springs and wells all over the country had been abnormally low. This year for the first time they had resumed their ordinary flow. What had happened in the district referred to was exactly what he should have expected as the result of the dry years and could not be attributed to the action of the Halkin drainage as stated by the hon. Member for Flint Boroughs.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 159; Noes, 61. (Division List No. 116.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Allen, Charles P.
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bell, Richard
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Brymer, William Ernest
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Butcher, John George
Caldwell, James
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cawley, Frederick
Chapman, Edward
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cremer, William Randal
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan)
Dewar, Sir T.R. (Tower Hamlets
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duke, Henry Edward
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Ellice, Capt E.C (SAndrw'sBghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Fenwick, Charles

Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fergusson, Rt.Hn.Sir J.(Manc'r
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Fuller, J.M.F.
Fyler, John Arthur
Gardner, Ernest
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gore, Hon. S.F.Ormsby-(Linc.)
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D.(Shrewsbury)
Gretton, John
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hamilton,Marq of(L'nd'nderry
Harwood, George
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Hobhouse,RtHn H(Somers't,E
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Houston, Robert Paterson
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Jeffreys, Rt.Hn. Arthur Fred.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Jones,William (Carnarvonshire
Kemp, Lieut.-Colonel George
Kennaway, Rt.Hn.Sir John H.
Keswick, William
Langley, Batty
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Jos. F. (Accrington)
Levy, Maurice
Long, Rt. Hon. W. (Bristol, S.)
Lowther,RtHn J.W(Cum.Penr.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Norman, Henry
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Peel, Hn.Wm.Robert Wellesley
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Rea, Russell
Reid, James (Greenock)
Reid, Sir R. Threshie(Dumfries
Remnant, James Farquharson
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rose, Charles Day
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sandys, Lt.-Col. Thos. Myles
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Shackleton, David James
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Slack, John Bamford
Smith,H C(North'mb.Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Rt.Hn.C.R(Northants
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'd Univ
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thomas, Sir A.(Glamorgan,E.)
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Tomkinson, James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Wason, Jn. Cathcart (Orkney)
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Wilson, Fred. W.(Norfolk,Mid.
Wilson, Henry J.(York, W. R.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Woodhouse,Sir J.T(Huddersf'd
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Yerburgh and Mr. Moss.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt.Hn.Sir H.
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Burke, E. Haviland
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Crean, Eugene
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, P. S. (Warwick, S. W.)
Hammond, John
Hayden, John Patrick
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Hunt, Rowland
Joicey, Sir James
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Mooney, John J.
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kelkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow,W.
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Roche, John
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, D. Alfred (Merthyr)
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Thomas Esmonde and Sir Charles M'Laren.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed.

LICENSING BILL.

Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on Amendment to Question [9th May], "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Which Amendment was,

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day six months.'—(*Mr. Burt.*)

Question again proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

MR. SPEAR (Devonshire, Tavistock) held that the House and the country were deeply indebted to the Government for the temperance measures they had passed for England and Scotland, and for proposing this measure, which would reduce the number of licences. It was a measure which should receive the most careful and anxious consideration of the House. He held that there were too many licensed houses and he was convinced that they would not secure any substantial reduction in the number except by recognising the principle of compensation. Hon. Members opposite had acquiesced in that principle under certain conditions, and that marked a nearer approach between the two sides than had hitherto been the case with temperance legislation. He appealed to all sides of the House for a careful consideration of the measure on these grounds. Excessive drinking had done enormous damage to the country, and considering the amount of money annually spent they should be anxious to do something to curtail that expenditure, and the evil consequences that followed thereon. Although the licence-holder had only one year's right, he had a moral claim of something like twelve or fourteen years holding in his licence. It was the recognition of that claim which had caused magistrates to abstain from withholding licences when in many instances it would have been in the interest of the community for them to cancel them. He held the reduction of the number of public-houses would cause some reduction in the amount of liquor consumed, but at the same time it would bring more custom to the surviving houses, and he thought the principle enunciated in the Bill that the surviving houses should compensate those whose licences were lost was sound and equitable. As far as that went he was in sympathy with the Bill. His objection to the Bill was not that it acknowledged the existence of that interest, but that it proposed to turn that interest into a permanent freehold. He was anxious to deal fairly by the licence-holder, but to create a permanent holding in the licence would be to inflict a great injustice on the rights of the people. He earnestly appealed to the Government, therefore, to introduce into the Bill a time limit. He would like to see a liberal time limit, even going so far as eighteen years, and the compensation given under the time limit should be on a sliding scale. There should be full compensation given to houses closed during the first year, seventeen-eighteenths during the second year, sixteen-eighteenths during the third, and so on. The contributions to the compensation fund should be *pro rata* or a similar sliding scale. It had been said that would inflict injustice on men who paid contributions for several years and then got no benefit from it. But those who had contributed to the fund all these years would have been receiving the advantage of the trade which they enjoyed, and there was no ground of complaint from that point of view. As the end of the time limit approached, having regard to the fact that a great number of the unnecessary houses would be closed, it would be quite easy for the surviving houses to form a mutual insurance fund for any further reductions that might be made.

His chief reason for advocating the introduction of a time limit was that they might do nothing to alienate the rights of the people to deal with this question as they thought right, after they had taken precautions to deal fairly with the vested interests of the licence-holders. He had another reason. Under the system proposed, contributions to the compensation fund would be levied on the better class of hotels. He did not say that the levy was too great, but they must remember that they were paying towards a fund from which they could never expect to receive any return whatever, because it was hardly likely that those licences would be withheld. It was too much to expect them to contribute heavily for all time towards the fund. In justice to them the time should come when the goodwill of the trade should have been supposed to have been equitably dealt with and the houses stand on their own responsibility. He should be glad, too, if the Government could see their way clear to insist that new licences should be granted with full knowledge that no compensation would be paid in case of their suppression. With regard to the magistrates' control he should be glad if the change could be avoided, although the decision of brewster sessions had always been liable to be overruled by quarter sessions. But whatever the tribunal was the people must have access to it to represent the wishes of the neighbourhood. If the Government fastened a permanent freehold in licences round the necks of the people they would not be promoting the cause of temperance reform.

*MAJOR JAMESON (Clare, W.) said it appeared to him that the Licensing Bill transferred no further power to quarter sessions, with the exception that it created a new power by allowing quarter sessions to agree that compensation should be paid, and in default of agreement as to the amount. H failed to see how in any way injustice was done to the magistrates. In his opinion, it would be absolutely necessary, in view of the probability of the justices' policy as to renewals, that some safeguards should be provided to insure that no injustice was done to those who were interested in the licence, other than the licensee, whereby they might suffer the loss of thousands of pounds in consequence of some trivial fault of the licensee which might only involve a nominal fine in itself. He intended, therefore, to propose an Amendment to Clause 1 to provide that there should be in all cases an appeal to quarter sessions for any first offence that was not enumerated for appeal to quarter sessions. Justices had in reality every right they were entitled to, and quarter sessions had alone to determine whether compensation should be given or not. By a large majority of the House, when the last Licensing Bill was under debate it was practically allowed that compensation ought to be given to those who were deprived of their licences. Even the right hon. Member for East Fife stated he would give them a "solatium"; thus approving of compensation, and only differing in the name he chose to apply to it. Again, in the somewhat remarkable speech they had on the First Reading of the Bill from the hon. Member for Spen Valley, who quoted a decision of 1852 to show that the public-houses had no claim to compensation—he would certainly say that licensed houses which had had fifty years of tenure since then had an inalienable right to compensation. That was absolutely beyond any argument. The hon. Member for Spen Valley also stated that public-houses had filled the gaols and prisons. He deprecated that assertion; excessive drinking might have helped to do so, but the ill-effects of drink had been far worse where no well-conducted public-houses were, and it had been shown without fear of contradiction that the number of public-houses in any district had had nothing whatever to do with the amount of drunkenness in that district. The hon. Member for Spen Valley forgot to add that the public-houses had also filled the Exchequer, for they had been taxed and pigeoned beyond any industry in this country, and he would ask hon. Members to recollect that when Mr. Goschen raised money from the trade for the purpose of compensation, they were plundered of their money, which was taken away for an entirely different purpose.

The hon. Baronet the Member for Camborne took the Prime Minister to task for having met the representatives of the trade with his usual courtesy. It was a great pity, in his opinion, that in a debate on the question of licensing, courtesy appeared to be forgotten by their opponents. He did not believe that any members of the trade desired anything but the public good and the public welfare, and it was monstrous that the good and well-being of the people should be claimed to be the desire of one Party only in that House, and that Members who were connected with the trade should be excluded by them from desiring to participate in the same. Those who stated that there should be a time limit to compensation appeared to forget that justice did not cease at any limited period, and that fifty years hence right would be right and equity would be equity. He regretted he was unable to speak on the subject of this Bill on the First Reading, but he had not the good fortune to be called, and he looked upon it that he lost the chance of a lifetime, for, for the first time during the ten years he had been in that House, he had the honour of sitting next to the hon. Baronet the Member for Camborne, for whom he had the deepest respect, and he could not help thinking that if he had had the opportunity of speaking to the House in the happy position in which he was then placed he could have brought home the fact of what a duet they could have played by relating what happened under similar circumstances in America. There the temperance party who desired licence reform sent out two lecturers all over the great cities of the United States, one was to lecture and the other was to be exhibited as the "miserable victim of intemperance." They were to take turn about as to which happy position they occupied. They agreed to take their turns in this way, but the "miserable victim of intemperance" declined to be the lecturer when the lecturer desired to take his turn as a "miserable victim of intemperance" so at the end of the first fortnight the lecturers were obliged to return home without having accomplished their work. He could not help thinking if the hon. Member for Camborne and himself were to pose before the House, one to lecture on intemperance, and the other (himself of course) to pose as "the miserable victim of intemperance," they, at all events, would not quarrel as regarded the positions they occupied, and there might be a happy alliance between the two.

The rejection of this Bill had been moved by the hon. Member for Morpeth, who told them that vested interests were well taken care of, especially the interests of the well-to do. He would like to point out that this Bill was to secure the interests not only of the well-to-do, but of those who would be thrown into penury and want by being compelled to renounce a trade which had been legalised by the State, and which had been conducted by them as respectable and honest citizens. The hon. Member for Morpeth quoted Napoleon who stated that "vices were better taxpayers than virtues." The hon. Member, in quoting the greatest despot that this world had ever seen, was advocating the despotism of the few as against the wants and desires of the many He spoke seriously of the great care that was being taken that no one who had a shadow of a slur upon his character should have a chance of getting a licence. Surely that would commend this Bill, not only to the hon. Member who had moved its rejection. but to every Member of the House. He stated that the families of public-house keepers as a rule turned out better than the families of ministers or of clergymen, and yet these were the very people he desired to see robbed of their trade, and plunged into misery and penury. He then spoke of John Bull's family, who, he said, should be taken care of. He stated that if there were no public-houses for him to go to, there would be enough money and to spare for all the wants that he or his family could have. Surely the teachings he should have learned from those places in America where total prohibition was practised and where there was more drunkenness than in any other country in the world, should have been a lesson to him in making such an assertion. The hon. Member for Morpeth also desired to revert to the liquor that met the wants of our ancestors. Did the hon. Member mean the liquor that was drunk by Adam and Eve, or did he mean the liquor of our immediate ancestors in Great Britain and Ireland fifty years ago, when it was the fashion to drink a bottle of port per head every night and lay in a stock of gout for all their unfortunate descendants. If so he differed from him upon this point. The hon. Member stated that his great hope was that people would not take more spirituous liquor than was good for them, and in this he cordially agreed, but that hope was in education.

The hon. Member for Morpeth had spoken of His Majesty the King's speech in Ireland the other day, in which His Majesty stated the enormous benefits that higher education would bring to Ireland,

and he trusted that would go to the hearts and minds of every Member of this House. But while speaking upon education, he would once more remind them that Mr. Goschen taxed the trade to the amount of £450,000 per annum in order to find money for compensation for non-renewals of licences, and that that money had been misappropriated, and part of it given to the county councils for the purposes of education. The hon. Member in moving the rejection of the Bill spoke of the healthier and better surroundings of the people, which alone could wean the British working man, who was inclined to take more spirituous liquor than was good for him, from the habit they all deplored. That alone could be done by better housing and by making him more comfortable at home, and the money of some of their greatest brewers and distillers had been voluntarily given for that purpose. He trusted that both healthier and better surroundings would be found by the State as well as by private individuals, but the rejection of this Bill would only increase the evils of which the hon. Member who moved its rejection spoke, and he hoped that in the interests of sobriety and of the honour and justice of this country the Bill now before them would be passed into law.

*COLONEL WILLIAMS (Dorsetshire, W.) said that if a time limit of seven or eight years were fixed it would afford ample time for writing down the value of licensed premises. It seemed to him that public opinion was so far awakening upon this subject that they ought to review the question some years hence. He hoped and believed that then public opinion would demand a far more drastic dealing with the question, and a more drastic reduction of licences than it did at the present day. They were told that the time limit would introduce a great deal of injustice to the trade, and that they would have to provide what had been called a double insurance in order to insure themselves if a time limit was fixed. He thought it had been forgotten that the situation with which they were now dealing was a new one, and public opinion had very much awakened within the last few years in regard to dealing with licences, and it was now earnestly desired that some speedy step should be taken to curtail the number of licences. It had also been realised that there had grown a certain limited vested interest in licences, and it seemed to him that some sort of limit, not so long as that mentioned by the hon. Member for Devonshire of eighteen years, but more like seven or ten years, should be adopted, and that would provide ample opportunity for the writing down of the licensed value above the value of the house without the licence. He thought that extra value had been very much exaggerated. Although it was quite true that there might be large gin-palaces and places where the licensed value was enormous, where the reduction would take place was in the public-houses in back streets and in country villages where the licensed houses were too thickly together. They had been told of instances where the business, but for the licence, would not be kept on, but if such business was a losing game then there could be no extra value in that house because it had a licence. There were many public-houses where the value was not increased by more than £50 or £100 because of the licence on account of the competition with other houses near at hand. It would not be just to pay a competition value. He had heard of an instance in a village where there was keen competition between two breweries to acquire a certain public-house, and one brewery gave a price far above its proper value in order to prevent the other brewery acquiring it. That was not the real value of the house, and therefore a competition value ought not to be accepted. It seemed to him that public opinion was so much awakening on this subject that they ought to have an opportunity for reviewing this question a few years hence.

The hon. Member for Spen Valley said he had hoped the Government would have produced a Bill which would have settled this question. To settle this question would take a long time, because public opinion changed very much from time to time, and public opinion upon this subject was now very different to what it was thirty years ago. Thirty years ago a Bill could not have been brought in dealing with compensation, but now such a proposal was made with the general approval of the country. Therefore he thought it was no hardship on the publican to put a time limit in the Bill, and to ask him to write down every year by 10 per cent. the value at which the house stood above its mere property value, and at the same time to provide for the extinction of some other licences. If his own licence was taken away the publican would benefit, and if his licence was not taken away he would benefit because the licences on each side of him might be taken away. The time limit would make the publicans and the brewers look more to the needs of the locality and judge more as to what houses were likely to continue. It would make them more careful as to the sort of house they bought and the sort of man they put into it. He hoped that the Government would see their way to introduce a time limit into the Bill. He should vote for the Second Reading because he thought that the time limit was a matter for discussion in Committee, but he reserved to himself the entire right of exercising his judgment on the Third Reading as to how far the provisions of the measure had been improved.

MR. MUNRO FURGUSON (Leith Burghs) claimed to take an interest in the fate of this measure as a Scottish Member, because they could not have freehold licences on the south side of the Tweed and yearly licences on the north side. Therefore he felt that the change of a licence from an annual to a freehold tenure was a matter in which the representatives of Scotland were equally interested. He found himself in very general agreement with the two last speakers. He believed it was essential to have a time limit, and although he did not adopt exactly the same form as the hon. Member for Morpeth, yet it came to much the same thing in the end. The question of a time limit traversed the whole principle of this Bill, which proposed to hand over the whole monopoly value of licences in England to the trade. He had an Amendment on the Paper which, instead of handing over the whole of the monopoly value of licences to the trade, as the Bill did, would secure the whole of the monopoly value to the people. That was the real issue raised between them in the discussion. He believed the policy of securing to the country the monopoly value of licences was a feasible policy, and it was one upon which he appealed to the Colonial Secretary, who took a great interest in this measure. Probably the least controversial of the measures enacted in the Transvaal since its union with the British Empire was the Transvaal Liquor Law, which provided for the elimination of the element of private property from the retail trade in liquor. That was the object to which they should direct their attention. It had been said that there was no alternative to the present policy, but he would suggest the elimination of the element of private property altogether. If there were no alternative, there might be strong arguments in favour of the Bill. It was said if property in licences was rendered secure and stable that capital would be attracted to it, and that it would be made respectable and responsible, and so forth; but the whole history of the conduct of the liquor traffic in England did not support that proposition. In the publications of Mr. Sidney Webb, and others who had given the history of the liquor trade, it was shown that the influx of capital into the trade had not been followed by responsibility, respectability, or sobriety. He did not believe that any influx of capital would secure the end they all had at heart. That was where this measure would fail.

The only security they had under the present system was the maintenance of the control of the justices and the maintenance of the public rights. What he objected to in the Bill was that it surrendered the public rights and in large measure the control of the justices. It surrendered the public rights in this way. it could not be said there was a freehold in licences at present. Licences did not fetch twenty-five years' purchase now. They might do so under the present Bill, but at present they did not fetch anything like the same number of years' purchase as ordinary private property. The balance was a public asset. They had no right to surrender that asset. They were the trustees of the public, and the public had rights under the existing system which they ought to be slow to surrender. For himself, he declined to surrender those rights and also to surrender control to the extent asked for by the Bill. He thought that under the Bill they would lose valuable public assets, and instead of travelling on the right road they were travelling on the wrong. The right road to follow was the elimination of private property in licences. That principle was not entirely strange to them. For the last two or three years many of them had been working hard on that question, and, if their efforts were not progressing rapidly, they were progressing surely, and the results were good. He himself was not an abstainer; but he took a part in that movement because he felt that the influence of the liquor traffic in local and political affairs was a bad influence. He wished to eliminate it, and he believed that under the trust system they would get rid of it in time. In Scandinavia the whole liquor traffic was under the trust system, and no one in Scandinavia would dream of returning to the former system of individual profits. The whole of that country was in favour of the elimination of private property in licences. Not only was that system applicable to a democratic country like Norway and to a monarchial country like Sweden, but it had been established to a great extent in Russia. He was not defending the Russian system, but it had accomplished a great deal of good, and had brought to the Russian Exchequer a gross revenue of £55,000,000, and a net revenue of £32,000,000, or £33,000,000. This country might, however, compare itself more fairly with Scandinavia. In Scandinavia alternatives to public-houses were established on a scale of which there was no conception in this country. In Gottenburg no resident would assert that the old system was better than that now established in that city. There public institutions were supported out of the liquor traffic, to the great advantage of the community. He thought, on the whole, that it could not be denied that that system was a success.

It was not fair to say that there was no alternative policy to the policy of the Government. It should not be assumed that the whole of the monopoly value of the trade belonged to it. The greater portion of it, in his opinion, belonged to the public, and the Government were asking the House to transfer a public right to the trade. As the representatives of the people they were not justified in doing that. By the Amendment which he suggested the retail trade would be freed from the liquor ring, and by giving fair notice compensation could be allotted to the trade. What that compensation should be was a matter of argument. Lord Peel proposed five years, he himself proposed seven years on the Scottish Licensing Bill, and he would not object to ten years if he could get a settlement of the question. But beyond ten years he would not go. He had had requests from a very important association in his constituency asking him to support the extension of the Bill to Scotland, but he declined, on the ground that the association was asking for what did not belong to it. They had now the choice between two opposite paths, the path which led to the control of the liquor traffic by the people for the people, and the path which led towards the transfer of the whole of the value of existing licences to the trade.

He himself did not believe in the importance of the clause to which the right hon. Gentleman the Colonial Secretary had alluded. The proposal was really nothing new. What was to be the criterion of the value of a public-house in a mining district? They might sink a shaft so that the value of a licence which was £300 before might be increased to £3,000. It was difficult now to fix ground values, but it would be ten times more difficult to fix the value of a licence so that the future unearned increment might go to the community or to a compensation fund. When the Archbishop of Canterbury stated the other day that the Bill would be likely to turn a publican's licence into a freehold it was contended by *The Times* that the licensed value would be as before the Bill was passed. But *The Times* admitted that the Bill omitted to provide any authentic record of value, which, however, it added was a defect which could be easily remedied. He himself was not quite sure that it could be easily remedied. The question was by what method they were to arrive at the value. The policy of the Government was to come to terms with the trade; but they could not come to terms with the trade except by surrender, and if they could not come to terms with the trade they must adopt the policy of the elimination of the element of private property. He was satisfied that the progress of that principle was such that the country would be ready to adopt the larger system, and that it was moving slowly but surely in the direction of eliminating private property. In his own county there were eight or nine trust companies. In many of the mining villages the miners had formed companies and established public-houses, the profits of which were more like four figures than three and were laid out in counter-attractions such as libraries, public halls and wash-houses. The system was not altogether defensible in theory, but it was very effective in practice; and it showed how, in even a rough community, they could have an element of control of the liquor traffic which was capable of producing results far better than any scheme which any Government had been able to introduce. They required greater security than they had in those village trusts; but the trusts in their essence had shown that even under very difficult conditions they had been able to eliminate private property. That was not an impossible policy in this country, according to the experience they had had. He had had this question very much at heart, and had worked for it in co-operation with many who did not hold his own political faith. He believed that as far as both Parties were concerned, the influence of the trade was an evil influence, which could not be got rid of except by the elimination of the element of private property in the control of the retail trade. If they had been able to show such results in Scotland, and if Lord Grey had been able to show such considerable results in England also, it could not be said that there was not a substantial policy opposed to the policy of the Government.

With gambling and speculation in licences they had nothing to do. From the rates at which licences were sold, it was evident that those who went into the trade went into it as a speculation, and they certainly should not be given twenty-five years purchase. The liquor monopoly had been fairly plundered by private adventures; and he should very much like to see that brought to an end. He should hesitate to oppose the Bill if it had a time limit, because he was perfectly satisfied that within a limited period the country would be educated up to the point of supporting a much more general system of licensing control under the trust system than anything they had been able to get by voluntary effort. He was sure also that a great deal of the money which was required to improve the general community could only be obtained from this monopoly; the value of which was £20,000,000 a year, and which was now used in a manner which was disastrous to the public and local life of the country.

*Mr. PEEL (Manchester, S.) said the hon. Gentleman who had just spoken said he would vote for the Bill unless he had any other alternative placed before him; but the alternatives mentioned by the hon. Gentleman were certainly not before the House and he was quite certain they never could be. The hon. Gentleman had been advocating two systems. He had been advocating the system associated with the name of Lord Grey. That system had certainly worked in some cases well; but he was quite certain it could not be introduced all over the country.

Mr. MUNRO FERGUSON said that what he stated was that he should hesitate to vote against the Bill if it contained a time limit.

*Mr. PEEL said that the hon. Gentleman was, therefore, prepared to vote for the Bill under certain circumstances; although he really advocated a totally different system. The temperance party were themselves strongly opposed to Lord Grey's scheme. He had himself some practical experience of that in his own constituency, and also as a member of the London County Council. Lord Grey came before a committee of the London County Council, of which he was a member, and argued with his usual vivacity and eloquence in favour of his scheme; but the temperance party rejected it. The hon. Gentleman also referred to the question of the elimination of private profit. Did he mean the municipalisation of the liquor traffic? He believed the temperance party was also opposed to that. The hon. Baronet the Member for the Camborne Division was very much opposed to it. He himself was also opposed to it, because he believed that no system could be worse than placing the management—he was not now talking of control—of the liquor traffic in the hands of the municipalities. It would be the worse kind of municipal trading it was possible to imagine. He thought the municipalities had already laid upon them all the duties they were capable of discharging; but, even if they had not, the liquor traffic was one which he would not like to see laid upon them. The Bill had been opposed strongly, but more as to its details than as to its principle. Only those opposed the Bill root and branch who, like the hon. Member for Camborne, were opposed to any kind of compensation whatever. They apparently thought that compensation should come from nowhere, from the pockets neither of the publican nor of the public. Into that dilemma the hon. Member for the Spen Valley Division refused to be drawn. It carried with it the further difficulty that as the fund available for compensation would necessarily be limited, there must inevitably be some limitation of the discretion of the magistrates in dealing with the whole of the licences under their control. He believed, however, that the limitation of discretion implied in the limitation of the fund was much more verbal than real, because the discretion of the magistrates could hardly be said to extend to the taking away of all the licences under their control.

The point he particularly wished to deal with was whether the Bill would give to the licence-holder a greater degree of security or a greater interest than he at present possessed. Mr. Arthur Chamberlain had placed the value of public-house property in the country at £300,000,000, which value he had declared would be doubled by this Bill, and that consequently the sum available for compensation would be extremely small in proportion. The hon. Member for the Spen Valley Division, a much more accurate authority, had rudely dispelled this dream of wealth, placing the value at £125,000,000, and even he had probably not taken into consideration the fact that compensation was not to be based on the value of the licence and of the house together.

Mr. WHITTAKER explained that his figures related to the value of the licences only.

*Mr. PEEL said he had not understood that. It was an extremely difficult sum to arrive at, and he failed to see how it could be done without a proper valuation, as the value of the houses varied considerably. But what was the precise advantage or value given to the trade by this Bill? At the highest it could not be described as a freehold, because that would entitle the owner to compensation out of public funds. The most the Bill would do was to entitle the publican to compensation out of the trade, and as the risk of losing the licence rarely materialised, except for misconduct, he thought that such a provision could hardly appreciate the value to any extent. The meaning of the words in Clause 2—"That the houses should be valued as if this Act had not been passed"—was rather obscure. If it meant that the present value, as estimated under some scheme, was to be taken as the value for a number of years to come, it would not allow for the ordinary fluctuations of value.

With regard to the time limit, there were great difficulties in the way of fixing any definite term. As the Bill gave power of borrowing on the fund, it was obvious that a time limit would be perfectly useless unless the money so borrowed had to be repaid within the term of the limit, and the money having to be repaid in a shorter number of years would diminish the number of houses that could be bought up. Two kinds of time limit had been suggested. One was that at the end of a certain number of years no compensation whatever should be paid. To make such a definite provision would be neither fair nor workable. It would fall very unequally on different classes of houses. Some would have enjoyed a greater security of tenure; others would have enjoyed a greater share of trade in consequence of the suppression of competing establishments; but a very large number, which had derived no advantage whatever from the suppression of houses, and had been paying to the compensation fund all the time, would suddenly find themselves in the position of having their licences taken away. He thought something more limited would have to be devised. The object of the Bill was not, he believed, to give any undue increment of value to the trade, and the idea should be rather to allow Parliament at the end of a certain period to deal with the question more freely. It had been the practice for owners to keep a certain number of public-houses going as a means of bargaining, as certain benches of magistrates had made it a rule not to grant a new licence unless an old one was surrendered. The Bill gave a statutory position to these negotiable instruments, and one of the conditions laid down for obtaining a new licence was the surrender of one or more old ones. He thought that full compensation for such houses ought not to be exacted, and he suggested that some provision, with proper safeguards, should be introduced by which the magistrates would have a discretion in the matter. Another class of cases in which a distinction should be drawn, were those in which licences were withdrawn on the joint grounds of misconduct and non-requirement.

He thought there was not sufficient stimulus in the Bill to quarter sessions to take action on their own account. They had no right to initiate any reduction of licences; they could act only when requested to do so by the brewster sessions. When the report was presented at quarter sessions it was only a report, and there was apparently no means by which that report could be defended. He thought, however, that the criticism of the position of magistrates at brewster sessions went for very little. Any Bill which provided a fund to be levied on the public-houses to be devoted to the extinction of some of their number must be open to the difficulty that it was limited and that to that extent the power of the magistrates was limited. But if they refused a Bill of this kind they were really thrown back on the system advocated by the hon. Member opposite of having no compensation at all. Those were the two alternatives—either compensation out of the trade and a limited number of houses taken away, or no compensation at all. He thought there was no possibility of a Bill giving no compensation ever being carried in this House.

And, it being Midnight, the debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed to-morrow.

ADJOURNMENT.

Motion made, and Question, "That this House do now adjourn"—(*Sir A. Acland-Hood*)—put, and agreed to.

Adjourned at one minute after Twelve o'clock.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Tuesday, 10*th May*, 1904.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with:—Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway (Steam Vessels).

The same was ordered to lie on the Table.

Croydon Gas Bill; St. Mary Woolnoth Bill [H.L.]; Brixham Gas Bill. Reported, with Amendments.

Alexandra (Newport and South Wales) Docks and Railway Bill [H.L.]—(on Re-commitment). Report from the Committee, read, and ordered to lie on the Table. Bill reported with further Amendments.

Sheppy Gas Bill. The Lord Balfour informed the House that the opposition to the Bill was withdrawn. The orders made on the 25th of April last and the 2nd instant discharged, and Bill committed.

London, Tilbury, and Southend Railway Bill. The Lord Balfour informed the House that the opposition to the Bill was withdrawn. The orders made on the 26th of April last and the 2nd instant discharged, and Bill committed.

Huddersfield Corporation Act, 1902 (Amendment) Bill [H.L.]. Commons Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Chippenham Gas Bill. Report from the Select Committee, That the Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the Bill, the opposition thereto having been withdrawn; read, and ordered to lie on the Table. The orders made on the 22nd of April last and the 2nd instant discharged, and Bill committed for Thursday next.

Wolverhampton Corporation Bill; Humber Commercial Railway and Dock Bill. Read 2^a, and committed. The Committees to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill (No. 74); Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill (No. 75). Read 1^a; to be printed; and referred to the Examiners.

Leicestershire and Warwickshire Electric Power Bill [H.L.]; Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Electric Power Bill [H.L.]; Great Yarmouth Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Cardiff Railway Bill [H.L.]. Read 3^a, and passed, and sent to the Commons.

Ryde Gas Bill. Read 3^a, with the Amendment, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill. Brought from the Commons.

Crystal Palace District Gas Bill; Tottenham Improvement Bill. Brought from the Commons; read 1^a; and referred to the Examiners.

Metropolitan Railway Bill [H.L.]; West Metropolitan Railway (Abandonment) Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments.

St. Marylebone Electric Lighting Bill. Report from the Committee of Selection, That the five Lords appointed a Select Committee on the Hutchesons' Hospital and Hutchesons' Educational Trust Bill [H.L.], and one other Bill, do form the Select Committee for the consideration of St. Marylebone Electric Lighting Bill; read, and agreed to; All petitions referred to the Committee, with leave to the petitioners praying to be heard by counsel against the Bill to be heard as desired, as also counsel for the Bill.

Metropolitan Police Provisional Order Bill. House in Committee (according to order). Bill reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3^a on Friday next.

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (Birmingham) Bill [H.L.], Read 2^a (according to order).

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

IRISH LAND COMMISSION (RULES).

Rule, dated 23rd April, 1904, as to Assistant Commissioners.

LOCAL LOANS FUND (ACCOUNTS, 1902-1903).

Accounts of receipts and payments by the Commissioners for the reduction of the National Debt in respect of the capital and income of the Local Loans Fund, for the year ended 31st March, 1903, together with the report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

STREET BETTING BILL [H.L.].

House in Committee (according to order).

Clause 1.

LORD BELPER said the first Amendment standing in his name on the Paper was one of a series of drafting Amendments, the object of which was to substitute for the phraseology of the Bill the words which were already in general use in local Acts and by-laws. The words which had been embodied in the local Acts had been repeatedly considered and interpreted in the High Court, and there had been found no difficulty with regard to convictions under them. It was thought better to adopt words which were well known to the Courts rather than a new set of words which possibly might give rise to difficulty.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 1, page 1, line 5, to leave out from the word 'person' to the second word 'any' in line 9, and to insert the word 'frequenting.'"—(*Lord Belper.*)

LORD DAVEY said he had no particular affection for his own drafting, and had no doubt that the experienced draftsman who advised the Government was much better able to frame the Bill than he was. He had no hesitation, therefore, in accepting the Amendment. With one exception, he saw no reason for objecting to the Amendments, which did not alter the substance of the Bill.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

LORD DAVEY said he was satisfied in his own mind that the words which he proposed in his Amendment to delete were perfectly idle and might lead to difficulties in construction which had better be avoided.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 1, page 1, lines 9 and 10, to leave out the words 'or any place to which the public have unrestricted access.'"—(*Lord Davey.*)

LORD JAMES OF HEREFORD said this Amendment arose out of some observations which were made on the Second Reading by Lord Newton, who referred to the racecourses at Epsom and Newmarket as places to which the public had unrestricted access. But the noble Lord was wrong, for the public had not unrestricted access to either of those places. He (Lord James) would prefer that the words remained, and could not conceive why it was proposed that they should be struck out. That they were of wide significance was an advantage, as it would prevent any evasion of the Act.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (The Earl of HALSBURY) concurred with Lord Davey as to the propriety of deleting the words. The object of the Bill was to prevent the nuisance of street betting—a very proper object. But he could not help thinking that if the wide words in question remained in the Bill, the result would be to set His Majesty's Judges a series of somewhat puzzling conundrums to solve. If the words were insisted upon he should divide the House against their being allowed to remain in the Bill. He was very glad that Lord Davey proposed to omit them.

LORD NEWTON said that when he instanced the two cases of Epsom Downs and Newmarket they were the only two that occurred to him at the moment; but there were numerous racecourses to which the public had unrestricted access. For instance, there was no racecourse in Ireland to which the public did not enjoy unrestricted access.

LORD DAVEY said the word "street" would be defined in an Amendment shortly to be moved by Lord Belper to mean "any highway, public bridge, road, lane, footway, square, court, alley, or passage, whether a thoroughfare or not." Surely that definition was wide enough to suit Lord James.

***THE LORD BISHOP OF HEREFORD** regretted the proposed omission of the words "to which the public have unrestricted access." If these words were left out it would surely lead to legal conundrums. According to his reading of the clause as proposed to be amended, it would be illegal for a bookmaker to ply his trade in St. James's Park or Kensington Gardens, but not illegal for him to ply it on Hampstead Heath or Wimbledon Common. In the city of Bristol, with which he was acquainted, he should like to know in which category Clifton Downs would be. He hoped that the Bill would put all such places on the same footing.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (The Marquess of LANSDOWNE) pointed out that according to an Amendment which Lord Belper would presently move, a "street" would mean "any highway, public bridge, road, lane, footway, square, court, alley, or passage, whether a thoroughfare or not." The places alluded to by the right rev. Prelate could not possibly come under that definition. The object of the Bill was to prevent the nuisance in places through which the public were in the habit of travelling.

***THE LORD BISHOP OF HEREFORD** referred to a portion of Clifton Downs which was intersected by roads and paths and said that in that case the bookmaker need only stand on the grass by the side of the road and he was apparently free to carry on his calling, notwithstanding the fact that he was within easy reach of people passing to and fro.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

LORD BELPER moved an Amendment to exclude from the places where betting should be illegal "any house licensed for the sale of intoxicating liquors." It would be remembered that on the Second Reading Lord Davey stated that these words were introduced in order to do away with a difficulty which had arisen in consequence of a decision in the High Court with regard to the use of public-houses for betting. It certainly did strike him (Lord Belper) that whether or not it was necessary to amend the law in that respect, it hardly seemed the proper way of effecting such amendment to extend for that purpose a Bill which dealt with street betting. He ventured to think that the extension of the Bill to betting in public-houses would raise a very contentious point, and one which would certainly not improve its chances of passing in another place. He therefore moved the deletion of the words, in order that the Bill should be strictly confined to the one object of making the law effective so far as street betting was concerned.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 1, page 1, lines 10 and 11, to leave out the words 'or any house licensed for the sale of intoxicating liquors.'"—(*Lord Belper*).

LORD DAVEY said the object of inserting these words in the Bill was to restore the law with regard to houses licensed for the sale of intoxicating liquors to what it was supposed to be before the decision of their Lordships' House to which he referred on the Second Reading. He felt the force of the practical observation made by the noble Lord, that to include the words in this Bill would raise a question which might prevent the Bill becoming law this session, and therefore he agreed, with regret, to the Amendment.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

LORD BELPER said his next Amendment was consequential on the adoption of the first Amendment.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 1, page 1, line 11, after the word 'liquors' to insert the words 'on behalf either of himself or of any other person for the purpose of bookmaking, or betting, or wagering, or agreeing to bet or wager, or paying or receiving or settling bets.'"—(*Lord Belper.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

LORD BELPER said the object of the next Amendment was to do away with any ambiguity which might exist. He was told that there were some points of difficulty in the words as they stood in the Bill, and it would be better to make the provision clear by the insertion of the words in his Amendment.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 1, page 1, line 11, to leave out from the first word 'shall' to the end of the sub-section, and to insert the words —(*a*) in the case of a first offence be liable, on conviction, under the Summary Jurisdiction Acts, to a fine not exceeding ten pounds; (*b*) in the case of a second offence be liable, on conviction, under the Summary Jurisdiction Acts, to a fine not exceeding twenty pounds; and (*c*) in the case of a third or subsequent offence, or in any case where it is proved that the person whilst committing the offence had any betting transaction with a person under the age of sixteen years, be liable on conviction or indictment to a fine not exceeding fifty pounds or to imprisonment, with or without hard labour, for a term not exceeding six months, without the option of a fine, or on conviction under the Summary Jurisdiction Acts, to a fine not exceeding thirty pounds or to imprisonment, with or without hard labour, for a term not exceeding three months, without the option of a fine, and shall in any case be liable to forfeit all books, cards, papers, and other articles relating to betting which may be found in his possession."—(*Lord Belper.*)

LORD DAVEY: The penalties in the Amendment are the same as in the Bill?

LORD BELPER: Yes.

LORD DAVEY: I accept it.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

LORD BELPER said the provision in the sub-section which he proposed to substitute was the better way of dealing with this matter. It did away with any necessity of referring to the Vagrancy Acts.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 1, pages 1 and 2, to leave out Subsection (2) and insert the words, 'Any constable may take into custody without warrant any person found committing an offence under this Act, and may seize and detain any article liable to be forfeited under this Act.'"—(*Lord Belper.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

LORD BELPER said that, as defined in the Public Health Act, 1875, "street" included any highway, but not a turnpike road, and for some reason or other a county bridge was not included. In those circumstances he thought the House would agree that it was desirable to amend the provision in the manner indicated in his Amendment.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 1, page 2, line 8, to leave out the words 'have the same meaning as in the Public Health Act, 1875,' and insert the words 'mean any highway, public bridge, road, lane, footway, square, court, alley, or passage, whether a thoroughfare or not.'"—(*Lord Belper.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 1, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 2.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR intimated that he proposed to move the omission of Clause 2 when the Question was put from the Chair that the clause stand part of the Bill.

LORD BELPER said that in order that the opinion of the House should be taken on the main Question he would not at this stage move the Amendments to Clause 2 standing in his name. He would postpone them till the Standing Committee stage, when they could be inserted if the clause still remained in the Bill.

On Question, That Clause 2 stand part of the Bill.

The LORD CHANCELLOR moved to leave out the clause. The Bill, he said, was for the purpose of putting down the nuisance of street betting. But, obviously, what this clause meant was that, in a place which was selected for sport, Epsom Downs, Newmarket, or what not, permission was given to the owners, managers, or trustees to issue notices which should have the effect of making this place, or such portion of it as they chose to select, a place within the meaning of the first section, or to enable them to reserve some place where betting mighg take place, and only to prohibit bettint in some part of it. He thought that was not at all within the spirit of the meaning of those who wished to prohibit betting. It was really giving a licence to bet to a certain number of selected persons. He did not very much like the phrase about the difference between legislation for the rich and the poor, but this was really a very remarkable example of that, and an entire departure from the object of the Bill. If the object were to make betting itself a misdemeanour, why not say so and try whether the public mind would stand that? If it were not, then he objected to these subterfuges by which that object was to be effected without boldly stating what was meant.

Amendment moved—

"To leave out Clause 2."—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

LORD DAVEY said the reason for the insertion of the clause was t restore the law to what it was supposed to be before the Kempton Park decision. The Betting Committee were informed, and he believed rightly informed, that the police would refuse to interfere with the betting fraternity who carried on their trade in any ground where athletic sports of any kind were taking place, and there was a large body of evidence before the Committee that these men were a nuisance to the people who went to watch the sports. Areas where sports were carried on were for the time being public places. Therefore he thought it was appropriate to include this clause in the Bill. If it was thought inexpedient to include racecourses, he should not object to an Amendment which would exempt them.

THE EARL OF ABERDEEN inquired whether the omission of the words "or part thereof" would meet one of the objections of the noble and learned Lord. It would prevent the reserving of a special space for privileged persons to carry on betting. The Committee had before them in considering a clause of this character the fact that in many places the owners or managers of grounds on which sports took place desired to prohibit betting because of the nuisance which resulted from it.

LORD NEWTON said that as a member of the Betting Committee he was as anxious as the noble and learned Lord who had introduced it to see the Bill pass into law. As was not unnatural, the noble and learned Lord was to a certain extent in love with his own Bill, but he would be well advised in accepting the Amendment. This Bill was not going to settle the betting difficulty or do away with the evils attending it. Something very much larger and more drastic would be required. He was anxious to see the portion of the Bill pass which dealt with street betting, and he thought the noble and learned Lord would run serious risk of losing his Bill altogether if he did not accept the Amendment and consent to the omission of this clause.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE thought the exhibition by persons controlling athletic grounds of notices to the effect that betting was prohibited, gave them a remedy against the inconvenience which the noble and learned Lord desired to remove. They would, he understood, be able to call in the police to turn out any persons who, in spite of such notices, persisted in betting or inviting bets within the grounds to which the notices had reference. It seemed to him that they might fairly leave the matter there.

LORD DAVEY said it was quite true that if the proprietor of a ground posted up a notice to the effect that no betting was allowed, it might be contended that that was a condition of the licence to enter the ground which he granted by the acceptance of the gate money, and that he might revoke the licence if the condition was not observed. But whether he could invoke the aid of the police he had his doubts. The police stated that they could not interfere in such a case; that was given in evidence before the Committee. No doubt the proprietor could remove the offenders by his own assistants, but he (Lord Davey) was very strongly of opinion that if the police were called in they would very properly refuse to interfere unless there was a riot or serious disorder. They would say that it was not their function to enforce the private rights of the owner of the ground. The noble and learned Lord the Lord Chancellor would remember a case in which a man who had his licence revoked at Ascot by the proprietors of the ground refused to leave and was ultimately removed, the case leading to litigation of an expensive and lengthy character.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: Yes, but it was decided in that case that the proprietors had a right to revoke the licence and that the man was properly turned out.

*THE LORD BISHOP OF HEREFORD expressed his satisfaction that the discussion had brought out what he trusted would be undisputed law, that the proprietors of an athletic ground, if they placed up a public notice that betting was not allowed or had that prohibition printed on the admission tickets, would be at liberty to eject any bookmaker who was plying his calling on that ground. He hoped that was quite clear.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: Perfectly clear.

*THE LORD BISHOP OF HEREFORD thought that in that case the Bill as it stood was better without the clause. He hoped that all proprietors of athletic grounds who desired to promote unadulterated sport would be made aware of the fact that if they took the proper precautions they could keep their grounds free from the betting nuisance.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 3.

Consequential Amendments agreed to.

Clause 3, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 4.

LORD BELPER moved to omit this clause, which defined the words "bookmaker" and "betting agent." He said the definitions were not necessary in consequence of the alteration in the wording of Clause 1.

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, to leave out Clause 4."—(*Lord Belper.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Remaining clause agreed to.

LORD DAVEY said it had been suggested to him, but he had not yet had time to look into it, that the Bill ought not to be made to apply to Ireland. The Betting House Acts originally applied to England only; they were extended to Scotland, but for some reason did not apply to Ireland. He did not know that that was any reason why this Bill should not apply to Ireland, and he was not aware of any difficulty in so applying it. Perhaps the noble Lord would ask those who were more conversant with the details of legislation of this kind whether there was any difficulty in applying the Bill to Ireland. If so, he would move a new clause in the Standing Committee.

Bill reported, with Amendments, to the House and recommitted to the Standing Committee; and to be printed as amended. (No. 73.)

NATIVE LABOURERS IN THE TRANSVAAL.

EARL CARRINGTON: My Lords, I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies when he will be able to present the promised Blue-books containing the reports with regard to the alleged ill-treatment and scarcity of native labourers in the Transvaal, referred to in the Colonial Secretary's speech in the Commons on Thursday, 5th May.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (The Duke of MARLBOROUGH): My Lords, the Secretary of State promised in the House of Commons last week that these Papers should be published as speedily as possible. The necessary formalities have already been gone through, the Papers are at the present time in the printer's hands, and we hope to be able to lay them before your Lordships' House in the latter part of this week.

THE UNITED IRISH LEAGUE.

LORD MUSKERRY: My Lords, I rise to ask His Majesty's Government whether their attention has been directed to a resolution of the South Galway Executive of the United Irish League, as reported in the *Connacht Leader* of 19th March last, according to which that body had decided on sending a circular to the secretary of each of its affiliated branches—

> "asking that the local committee would take into consideration what action should be taken by them, with a view of compelling the landlords to sell before the next May rents became due,"

and containing a further instruction to these branches—

> "to send a delegation without fail to the next meeting of the executive to explain what is being done by each branch;"

what steps, if any, the Government have taken to put a stop to such lawless conduct, or to meet the contemptuous defiance hurled by the South Galway Leaguers at the "voluntary principle" supposed to have been embodied firmly in the Irish Land Act of last session; and further, to ask, in the event of no action having yet been taken, whether the Government realise the effect of tamely ignoring such a menace, not alone to the property of those landlords affected thereby, but also to the agrarian peace of the West of Ireland.

THE EARL OF DENBIGH: My Lords, the matter to which the noble Lord has referred has attracted the attention of His Majesty's Government, and I have to inform him that there is no doubt that the resolution referred to was mischievous and illegal, and any attempt to carry it out in action would involve the partise concerned in crime. The May gale has not yet been collected. Up to the present moment there has not been any overt act committed in furtherance of the objects of the suggested combination, but the police are giving the matter their close attention, and His Majesty's Government will be prepared to take all measures necessary to protect the liberty and property of individuals and to enforce the law.

*LORD CLONBROCK: My Lords, I, to some extent, anticipated the answer which has just been given. In fact, I expressed some doubt when my noble friend showed me his Question as to whether it would not be better to defer calling attention to the matter until something more definite occurred, or at least until it had been seen whether the resolution to which the Question referred had been adopted by, or had commended itself to, other parts of the county. But while I thought the Question somewhat premature, I am extremely glad to hear that the matter has not escaped the notice of His Majesty's Government. In the West, especially, of Ireland, the expectations of the people have been raised to such a pitch by articles in the Nationalist Press and by speeches made in different parts of the country that the voluntary character of the Act of last year appears to be quite lost sight of, and the belief seems firmly fixed in their minds that a landowner is bound to sell his property to his tenants at whatever terms it may be perfectly convenient for the tenants to offer. The consequence is that only very ruinous terms are offered—terms such as no man who is prepared to sell, or even is anxious to sell, can possibly accept; and the Act to a very large extent remains a dead letter. The result is that there is great disappointment and a smouldering discontent which past experience teaches us may be fanned into a flame and lead to a renewal of the land war—a state of things which would not only be injurious to landlords, but most detrimental to the peace and prosperity of the whole country. I am very glad, therefore, to hear that His Majesty's Government have their attention directed to the subject, and I hope they will do their utmost to check any species of intimidation or agitation that might lead to such a result.

THE EARL OF CORK: My Lords, I have heard with great pleasure the statement of the noble Earl who represents the Irish Office, for I am, perhaps, the last individual in this House who has suffered from the Land League. For a number of years I have never had the slightest difficulty with any one of my tenants. But, unfortunately, a short time ago a body of them suddenly appeared before my agent, and, almost putting a pistol to his head, demanded that he should sell my property at the ridiculous price of something like nineteen years purchase. Considering that the property adjoins the city of Cork that offer could not, of course, be entertained for a moment. What has been the result? The Land League held a big meeting on Sunday. They abused me and my agent, and I was distinctly told that I should not receive any more rent until I agreed to come to terms with my tenants. Now that is a very serious state of things to be existing at this moment in Ireland, and if His Majesty's Government do not speedily take steps to attend to it the Act which we all looked to as creating peace and contentment in that country will have the opposite effect.

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes past Five o'clock, to Friday next, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 10*th May*, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

MR. SPEAKER'S INDISPOSITION.

The House being met, the Clerk at the Table informed the House of the unavoidable absence of Mr. SPEAKER, owing to indisposition—

Whereupon Mr. JAMES WILLIAM LOWTHER, the Chairman of Ways and Means, proceeded to the Table, and after Prayers, took the Chair as Deputy Speaker, pursuant to the Standing Order.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz.: — Llanelly Harbour Bill [Lords]; Metropolitan District Railway Bill [Lords]; Shipley Urban District Council Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz.: — Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill.

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time To-morrow.

Wellington (Somerset) Gas Bill. Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Crystal Palace District Gas Bill. Read the third time, and passed. [New Title.]

Metropolitan Railway Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Tottenham Improvement Bill. Read the third time, and passed.

West Metropolitan Railway (Abandonment) Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, with an Amendment.

City of London (Central Criminal Court House) Bill. Read a second time, and committed.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill. Read the third time, and passed.

Commons Regulation (Merrow) Provisional Order Bill; Commons Regulation (Oxshott) Provisional Order Bill. Read a second time, and committed.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 14). Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to Brighouse, Pwllheli, Wath-upon-Dearne, and Worthing, and the North Staffordshire Joint Smallpox Hospital District, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Grant Lawson and Mr. Walter Long.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 14) Bill. "To confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to Brighouse, Pwllheli, Wath-upon-Dearne, and Worthing, and the North Staffordshire Joint Smallpox Hospital District," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 190.]

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—Metropolitan Common Scheme (Hillingdon East) Provisional Order Bill; Metropolitan Common Scheme (Farnborough) Provisional Order Bill, without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to provide for the Sale of the Chapel of Saint James, Westmoreland Street; and for other purposes connected therewith." [Marylebone Chapels (Saint James, Westmoreland Street) [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to provide for the transfer of the undertaking of the Minehead Waterworks Company, Limited, to the Minehead Urban District Council and to confer further powers on the said Council with respect to the supply of water; and for other purposes." [Minehead Urban District Council Water Bill [Lords.]

And, also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to authorise the Wakefield and District Light Railway Company to construct tramways and a tramroad and other works in the West Riding of the County of York; and for other purposes." [West Riding Tramways Bill [Lords.]

Marylebone Chapels (Saint James, Westmoreland Street) Bill [Lords]; Minehead Urban District Council Water Bill [Lords]; West Riding Tramways Bill [Lords]. Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

PETITIONS.

BILLS OF EXCHANGE BILL.

Petition from Walsall, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

CANAL TRAFFIC BILL.

Petition from Walsall, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (LOCAL AUTHORITY DEFAULT) BILL.

Petition from North Anglesey, against; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions for alteration; from Dumbarton; and Orkney (two); to lie upon the Table.

FALSE STATEMENTS (COMPANIES) BILL.

Petition from Walsall, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP ACT (1901) AMENDMENT BILL.

Petition from Walsall, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

LICENCES (RENEWAL).

Petitions against alteration of Law; from Radstock; Nottingham (two); Carlingcott (three); Peasedown (three); South Twerton; Weston-super-Mare; South Shields (two); Somerset; Bulwell (two); Dulverton; Sileby (two); Carlisle; Feltham; Sheffield (four); Shipley; Bath; Northampton; Holt; Horsham (two); Bristol (two); Halifax; Strood; Chippenham; Atworth; East Islington; Sandgate; Folkestone; Southwater; Edinburgh; Bournemouth; Kilburn; Teesdale; Ashton under Lyne (two); Lewes; Sittingbourne; Sheerness; Rainham; Hoole; Warrington (two); Holborn; Latchford; Preston; Heeley; Darnall; Carbrook; Colyton; Deptford; Wokingham; Oakleigh; Douglas P. Lees; Wood Green; Roddy Moor; Sidmouth; Oldham; St. Leonards; Brixham; Hadleigh; Moorland Road; Ansty; Workington; Oldbury; Lancaster; Morecambe; Westbourne; Barrowford; Walton on the Naze; Dorset; Yeovil; Amlwch; Holyhead; Normanton; Gloucester (two); Fenton; Liverpool (two); Brighton; Holywell; Weston; Tow Law; Maidenhead; King's Lynn; Dolgelly (five); Corwen; Norwood; East Dulwich; Penrhyn; Darlington; Nelson (six); Driffield (six); Ealing; Little Heath; Workington; Cockermouth; Stalybridge (two); Hebburn; South Tottenham; Astley Bridge (five);

Bolton (three); Huddersfield (two); Leicester; Burnley; Accrington; Manchester; Brearley; Allerton; Miles Platting; Abergavenny; Griffithstown; Llanhilleth; and Bath; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions against; from St Albans (two); Rochester; Bratton; Durham; Higher Openshaw; Bruntcliffe; Gospel Oak; Eccleshill; Feltham; Weston super Mare; Birmingham (three); Tunbridge Wells (two); Waterhouses (three); Westminster (two); Westbury; York (five); Malton; Rayleigh; Upper Poppleton; Shrewsbury; West Nottingham; Stroud; South Shields; Weston; West Twerton; Bulwell; Nottingham; Attercliffe; Pontmorlais; Lower Weston; New Wortley (six); Bishop Stortford; Warrington; Porth (nine); Ynysbwl (nine); Hafod (three); Hopkinstown (two); Wolverhampton; Torry; Treforest (two); Pontypridd (fourteen); Cilfynydd (five); Penuel; Wattstown (two); Linton; Birkdale (two); Southport (seven); Blowick; Christchurch; Bournemouth (seven); Chesterfield; Ringstead; Oxford; Elland cum Greetland; Inverness; Bath (four); Aberdeen (four); Farnworth (three); Bolton (ten); Abingdon on Thames; Faringdon (two); Macclesfield; Northampton (seven); Loughborough (five); Kilburn; Leicestershire and Rutland; Islington; Llanrug; Harrogate (two); Keynsham; East London; Bloomsbury; Hornsea; Birstall; Finsbury Park (two); Widnes (eleven); Heywood; Wolsingham; Frosterley; Dundee (five); Rotherham (two); Eccles; Landore; Lancaster (two); Kearsley Mount; Moses Gate; Paddington; Clitheroe; Heywood; Dalton in Furness (two); West Dorset; Llantrisant; Trallwn; Coedpenmaen; Cardiff (two); Glasgow (four); Clydebank; Montacute; Norwich; Oldham; Dawley; Warrington; Bermondsey; Wiveliscombe (two); Axminster; Borthygest (two); Morfa Bychan; Battersea; Falkirk; Rotherhithe; Edinburgh; Derby; Burnley (four); Padiham; Bristol; Gloucester (six); Gosforth; Widnes; Torquay (three); Bury; Tredegar; Chester; Richmond; Hale; Somersham; West Ham; Eaglescliffe; Tow Law; Bradford; Stratford; Blaenllochan; Preston; Tovil; Aston; Pontypridd and Rhondda; Treorchy (ten); Pentre (seven); Ystrad; Gelli; Trealaw (three); Sherwood; Ton Pentre (six); Clydach Vale (three); Cwm Clydach; Bleanrhondda (four); Ystradfodwg (two); Penygraig (two); Tonypandy (seven); Blaenclydach (three); Ferndale (six); Ynyshir (five); Tylorstown (four); Pontygwaith (four); Gilfach Goch; Treherbert (eight); Llwynypia (three); Ystrad (four); Trerhondda; Tynewydd; Bodringalt; Blaenycwm; Pentrhondda (two); Maerdy; Little London; Greet; Sparkhill; Tyseley; Workington; Camberwell; Holloway (four); Longhope; Crouch Hill; Greenock (eight); Liverpool (three); Whitley Bay (two); Burradon; Amble; Radcliffe; Whitley (two); New Hirst; Heywood (five); East Plumstead; East Ham; St. Andrews; Bowes Park; Harpole; Barrhead; Gourock; Stranraer; Gateshead (seven); Bury; London Wesleyan Methodist Conference; Coleford; Hopwood; Saltwell; Moor Lane; Blockley; Beccles; Crumlin (two); Blaenau Festiniog; Llandrillo; Westhoughton; United Free Church of Scotland; Gwynedd; Caersalem; Brixton; Glanrafon; Penrhyn Dendraeth; West Norwood; Barmouth; Dacre; Wisbech; Mansfield; Guiseley; Ryde; Isle of Wight (two): Mealsgate; Penrith; Chesterfield; South West Ham; Poplar and Bromley; Accrington; Oswaldtwistle; Hucknall Torkard; King's Lynn (three); Belfast; Keighley (two); Denholme; Merioneth; Edeyrnion; Birkenhead (three); Newport (Pembrokeshire); Stirling; Southend; Leigh on Sea; St. Leonards (five); Hastings (six); Carluke; Maesteg; Blaengarw; Peniel; Pontycymmer; Nantymoel (three); Pontychyll; Llanfyllin (five); Street (three); Maryport; Esk; Langley Moor; Bearpark; Sowerby; Greenfield; Dirkhill; Manningham; Walsall; Great Horton; Dursley; Uley; Eastcombe; Blackburn; Ely; Manchester (two); Marple; Patricroft; Langley Park; Burwell; Saltley (two); Winton; Frizington; Heckmondwike (two); Cleckheaton; Rookhope; Batley (two); and Cwmparc; to lie upon the Table.

MORTGAGE OF PREMISES BILL.

Petition from Walsall, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RAILWAYS (PRIVATE SIDINGS) BILL.

Petition from Walsall, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RATING OF MACHINERY BILL.

Petition from Walsall, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RE-VACCINATION BILL.

Petition from Gateshead, against; to lie upon the Table.

RE-VACCINATION BILL.

Petition from Huddersfield, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE MARKS BILL.

Petition from Walsall, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

WAGES BOARDS BILL.

Petition from Walsall, against; to lie upon the Bill.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES BILL.

Petition from Walsall, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION BILL.

Petition from Walsall, against; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

IRISH LAND COMMISSION (RULES).

Copy presented, of Rule made by the Irish Land Commission under the Land Purchase Acts, dated the 23rd April, 1904 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 165.]

GAS UNDERTAKINGS (LOCAL AUTHORITIES).

Copy ordered, "of Return relating to all authorised Gas Undertakings in the United Kingdom belonging to Local Authorities, for the year ended the 25th day of March, 1904 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 330, of Session 1903)."—(*Mr. Gerald Balfour.*)

GAS UNDERTAKINGS.

Copy ordered, "of Return relating to all authorised Gas Undertakings in the United Kingdom other than those of Local Authorities, for the year ended the 31st day of December, 1903 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 331, of Session 1903)."—(*Mr. Gerald Balfour.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Light Dues and Lighthouse Expenditure.

MR. PLUMMER (Newcastle-on-Tyne): To ask the President of the Board of Trade if he will state the total amount of light dues collected in the United Kingdom during the year ending 31st March, 1904, also the amount expended on the lighthouse service during the same period (showing separately the expenditure on new works), and the balance in hand at the close of the year.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) The amount of dues collected in the United Kingdom during the year in question was £497,240. I regret that I am unable to supply the hon. Member with the other information for which he asks as the accounts for the year have not all been received.

Irish Lights Board—Instructions to Lightship Keepers.

MAJOR JAMESON (Clare W.): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he will give instructions that the following clause shall be inserted in the instructions to lightship keepers in the service of the Irish Lights Board:—"In the event of the vessel being driven from her station the officer in charge is to carefully consider whether she has drifted for such a distance or in such a direction as to make it dangerous to shipping to continue to show her lights, and if the distance of direction be not such as to endanger their safety the lights and balls or other masthead marks which help to distinguish the light vessel by day are to be continued in the usual manner;" whether he will state how many of the head and assistant keepers of Irish lightships have certificates in navigation such as would fit them to exercise a useful discretion in deciding whether a lightship when off her charted position would be likely to be a danger to shipping; and whether he will give instructions to ensure that such a regulation is carried out in the interests of shipping.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) The instructions issued by the Commissioners of Irish Lights to their lightship keepers in the contingency contemplated by the Question are the same as those issued by the other general lighthouse authorities. I will direct the attention of the Commissioners of Irish Lights to the clause proposed by the hon. and gallant Member; its adoption is a matter for the Commissioners and not for the Board of Trade. I am informed by the Commissioners that the masters and mates of all their lightships possess Board of Trade certificates.

Removal of Pathway in St. James' Park.

SIR JOHN LENG (Dundee): To ask the hon. Member for Chorley, as representing the First Commissioner of Works, if he is aware of the inconvenience caused to frequenters of St. James' Park by the removal of the walk round the west end of the ornamental water; and, if so, whether he will consider the desirability of replacing it by a walk or foot-bridge contiguous to the new wall.

(*Answered by Lord Balcarres.*) When the terraces are opened to the public it is hoped that any inconvenience now caused will be removed. The First Commissioner regrets that he is unable to make a walk or foot-bridge at the foot of the new wall, as either would be very unsightly.

Corporal Punishment in Poor Law Institutions.

SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston); To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether, in view of the punishments inflicted on children who are withdrawn from public supervision and protection in Poor Law institutions, such as that inflicted on a boy in the St. Giles' Receiving Home in January last, who was returned to the Westminster Union with both cheeks black, both arms black, and bruises on his legs, or that lately inflicted on a boy in the village community of the Wolverhampton Guardians, the Department will issue such regulations as will prevent excessive corporal punishment in the future by requiring the resignation of any officers guilty of such practices.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) The regulations in force in respect of workhouses contain rules which are intended to prevent excessive corporal punishment. They prohibit corporal punishment altogether in the case of a girl, and, in the case of a boy, direct that the rod or other instrument shall be approved by the guardians or visiting committee. Two officers must, if possible, be present when the punishment is given, and it is not to be inflicted until two hours have elapsed after the commission of the offence. The particulars of the punishment are required to be entered in a book which has to be laid before the guardians. Similar rules are contained in the special orders issued for Poor Law schools and like institutions. Any officer infringing the rules or administering excessive corporal punishment is liable to censure or removal from office, as the case may require. The rules are, I think, sufficient usually to prevent undue punishment, but where a case of excessive punishment is reported to me I am prepared to deal with any officer in fault in the matter in such way as in the circumstancs may be necessary. I may add that, as I understand, the bruises, etc., in the first case referred to in the Question are not admitted to have been caused by punishment at all.

New Guns for 4th West York Artillery Volunteers.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): To ask the Secretary of State for War if there is any hope of the fulfilment in the near future of the long-standing promise to provide the Fourth West York Artillery Volunteers and other corps of Volunteer artillery with modern guns in the place of obsolete cannon, having regard to the important part now taken by artillery in modern war.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) Forty-four Volunteer heavy batteries have been armed with the 4·7 inch gun. The re-armament of the remaining eighty-one batteries with 15-pr.

guns has been commenced, and forty-eight guns have been issued. Further issue will be made as similar guns become available when the Field Artillery is re-armed. Two of these forty-eight guns issued have been allotted to the Fourth West York Artillery Volunteers.

Chinese Labourers in the Transvaal—Cost of Repatriating Wives and Children.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, under any regulations to the Transvaal Ordinance (and, if so, which), the cost of repatriating the wives and children of a labourer who is returned to China at the end of his indenture will fall on the employer and not have to be borne by the labourer himself.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*) The obligation is imposed on the importer by Section 33 (2) of the Ordinance.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

North Sea Fisheries—Sea Temperature.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he will state how many days last year the "Jackal" was engaged in preparing for and performing cruises to the neighbourhood of Norway and the Faroes Islands for the purpose of taking temperatures of the sea; and what remuneration was paid to the captain for this work in addition to his naval pay.

*THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. PRETYMAN, (Suffolk, Woodbridge): The number of days was forty-nine, during which three cruises were made, for each of which cruises the captain received £25.

Coastguard Buildings.

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the dwellings occupied by the Coastguard have been examined with a view of ascertaining whether these dwellings are in conformity with the Health Acts; if so, when such examination was made; and whether, in the event of no such specific inquiry having been made within the last three years, he will cause full inquiry to be instituted, and present the result in detail to the House.

*MR. PRETYMAN: No such specific examination as that referred to has been made, nor is such an inquiry considered necessary. All Coastguard buildings are in charge of Admiralty Works Officers. They are periodically examined and any defects brought to light are attended to.

MR. CLAUDE HAY: Are the Admiralty satisfied that the dwellings referred to in the Question conform in every respect to the Public Health Acts, both as regards cubic space, and the number of persons inhabiting each room.

*MR. PRETYMAN: It is impossible to say that every building out of the very large number comply with the law in every respect, but defects are remedied as they are discovered and a large sum of money is being expended in improvements.

Unclaimed Dividends on Consols.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he will state whether any Return of unclaimed dividends on Consols is published; and, if not, will he say what efforts are made to trace the owners.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): No Return of unclaimed dividends on Consols is published. Before the time arrives for transferring unclaimed stock and dividends to the National Debt Commissioners, notices are sent out by the Bank of England to the stockholders. If these notices are returned through the Post Office, further efforts are made, where possible, to reach the stockholders through their stockbrokers or others who may have acted for them under powers of attorney. At all times the Bank officials are ready to give assistance to persons who apply to them in the belief that they are interested in unclaimed stock.

MR. WEIR: Will the right hon Gentleman have the list advertised?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I have considered the question of advertising a list of these unclaimed stocks, but the information at my disposal leads me to the conclusion that it is very undesirable. At one time they were advertised and it led to very great abuses.

Dog Licences

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he will state how many persons have been fined for keeping dogs without a licence during last year and from 1st January to 30th April this year, respectively, and the average amount of the fines.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The records kept by the Inland Revenue do not present the statistics desired in a collected form, and I am informed that it would take a considerable time to collect and present them as the hon. Member wishes. Under the circumstances it seems doubtful whether the object to be attained would be worth this expenditure of labour.

MR. WEIR: Can the right hon. Gentleman state the amount realised in fines?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I cannot without notice. I do not know if any record is kept. If the hon. Member has any special object in asking for the information perhaps he will communicate to me privately and I will consider whether it is worth while to undertake the expense and trouble of getting it.

Unregistered Friendly Societies and the Income-tax.

MR. GEORGE WHITELEY (Yorkshire, W.R., Pudsey): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he will state under which provision or section of the Income-tax Acts or other decision or regulation is an unregistered friendly society, whose total annual income from invested money from all sources does not exceed £160, debarred from obtaining the recovery of deducted income-tax under Section 163 of the Income-tax Act of 1842, as amended by Section 34 of the Finance Act of 1894.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The exemption in favour of persons whose incomes do not exceed £160 per annum is confined to individuals and bodies politic or corporate and does not extend to other composite bodies. This limitation is imposed by Section 192 of the Income-tax Act of 1842 which defines "person" as including "bodies politic or corporate," but makes no reference to other bodies. In the case of small unregistered friendly societies, however, exemption is frequently allowed on the ground that they are established solely for charitable objects, and the Board of Inland Revenue will be glad to consider any such case that the hon. Member may submit to them.

MR. GEORGE WHITELEY: Will the right hon. Gentleman permit me to communicate with him privately?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Perhaps the hon. Gentleman will communicate with the Board of Inland Revenue which will consider any particular case.

Orkney Mail Delays.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that on Monday, 25th April, the mail steamer from Orkney was ordered out of her course, and that in consequence the train connection south was lost at Wick, with the result that the mails of the whole county were detained for one day; and, if so, will he inquire upon whose instructions the captain acted.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): I have made inquiry on this subject, and it is stated by the captain of the mail steamer from Orkney that owing to the state of the weather on the 25th ultimo, he was obliged to proceed to Wick instead of Scrabster, and that it was only when he found that the connection at Wick with the train would be lost in any case that he decided to call at Switha. The permission given by the Post Office on this occasion was that the steamer might call at Switha if no appreciable delay would be caused to the mail service.

Mr. CATHCART WASON: Will the right hon. Gentleman direct that these calls shall not be made in the future?

Lord STANLEY: It is a convenience to some people at the cost of no inconvenience to others. I cannot think any harm is done.

Mr. CATHCART WASON: A large number of passengers were detained a whole day at Wick.

British Mail Steamers searched by Belligerents.

Sir CHARLES PALMER (Durham, Jarrow): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether postal letters are regarded as contraband of war; and, if not, whether a British mail steamer can be stopped and detained for the purposes of searching for belligerents' letters in charge of the British Post Office.

Lord STANLEY: Ordinary postal letters are not contraband of war, but it is possible that despatches addressed to, or intended for, the Government of a belligerent State by its accredited agents (or *vice versa*) might be treated as such. No general rule of international law has been established giving any special immunity to mail steamers; but the right to visit and search in respect of such vessels should, having regard to their special circumstances, be so exercised as to minimise the inconvenience that may result.

Joyce Green Smallpox Hospital—Inoculation of Dogs.

Mr. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that it is proposed to inoculate dogs with smallpox virus at the Joyce Green Smallpox Hospital; will he say how many dogs will be inoculated, and whether more than one experiment will be carried out on each dog.

*The SECRETARY of STATE for the HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. Akers-Douglas, Kent, St. Augustine's): No application has yet been made to me for permission to make any such experiments as are indicated in the Question; and I have nothing to add to the answer on the same subject which I gave to the hon. Member for Northampton last Thursday.†

Military Convicts.

Mr. CLAUDE HAY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he will state the number of soldiers now undergoing punishment in the convict and local prisons; and the number, if any, therein whose sentences to imprisonment do not involve discharge from the Army.

*Mr. AKER-DOUGLAS: There are 49 soldiers at present in convict prisons and 250 in local prisons, making a total of 299. The sentences of eighty-four of these prisoners do not involve discharge from the Army, but they are all for civil offences—not offences against military discipline—and in fourteen of them the sentence was passed by a Civil Court.

Avoch Harbour.

Mr. WEIR: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether the petition of the Harbour Trustees of Avoch, Ross-shire, referred to in the Board's letter of the 30th March last, and praying for a grant in aid of works in connection with Avoch Harbour, has yet received consideration; and, if so, will he state whether he is now in a position to say if the desired grant will be made.

The PRESIDENT of the BOARD of TRADE (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central): I am in communication with the Secretary for Scotland and the Fishery Board with repect to the petition of the Harbour Trustees of Avoch, and the matter is still under consideration.

Irish Fishermen and the Labourers Act.

Mr. SHEEHAN (Cork County, Mid.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if it is his intention to include in the Labourers (Ireland) Bill a specific provision to entitle fishermen, as such, to all the benefits of the Labourers Acts.

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Mr. Wyndham, Dover): A fisherman to be eligible for a cottage must come within the definition of the term "agricultural labourer" prescribed by Section 4 of the Labourers Act, 1886, as amended by Section 93 of the Irish Land Act of 1903. It is not proposed to extend the definition so as to entitle fishermen, as such, to the benefits of the Labourers Acts.

---

† See page 523.

MR. SHEEHAN: Did not the right hon. Gentleman promise to make inquiry as to the claims of fishermen to be included in any future Bill?

MR. WYNDHAM replied in the negative.

Aughris Fishing Station.

MR. WILLIAM McKILLOP (Sligo, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to a resolution recently adopted by the Dromore West (county Sligo) District Council, requesting the Irish Government to have the division of Aughris scheduled as a congested district, with the object of facilitating the improvement of the local fishing station; will the application of the district council be granted; is he aware that the district of Tireragh, of which Dromore West forms a part, has been excluded from any participation in the benefits conferred on other congested districts similarly circumstanced in Mayo, Donegal, and other parts of Ireland under the Pirrie and Iveagh Scheme, the Light Railways Acts, and the Marine Works Act; and can he say what steps the Irish Government propose to take to develop this district by improved transit and fishing accommodation.

MR. WYNDHAM: There is no power to comply with the application of the district council. In respect of the second part of the Question, a pier and boatslip were built at Aughris by the Board of Works in 1885, but it has not led to a development of the fishing industry. Only five fishery loans have been applied for from this district in the past five years. They were all granted.

Vagrancy in Ireland.

MR. HUGH LAW (Donegal, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has yet communicated with the President of the Local Government Board with reference to including Ireland in the proposed inquiry regarding vagrancy; and, if so, with what result; and whether, in the event of such inclusion not being decided upon, he will initiate a separate inquiry into the question as it affects Ireland.

MR. WYNDHAM: Yes, Sir. My right hon. friend the President of the English Local Government Board is of opinion, in which I concur, that the investigation he contemplated into the subject of vagrancy should be limited to England and Wales. The Vice-Regal Commission appointed to report on the Irish Poor Laws is inquiring into matters affecting vagrancy in Ireland, so far as covered by the terms of reference to the Commission. The suggestion in the second part of the Question will be considered when the Vice-Regal Commission has furnished its Report.

Irish Department of Agriculture.

MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will grant a Return of the officials transferred, under the Agriculture and Technical Instruction Act, 1899, from the Veterinary Department of the Privy Council to the Department of Agriculture, etc., giving names, amounts of salaries prior to transfer, and present salaries.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Question is identical with one put by the same hon. Member on 18th April. I am unable to grant the desired Return for the reasons stated by me in answer to that Question.†

Deportation of Paupers to Ireland.

MR. DELANY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a warrant for the removal of a pauper named Frank Milner, aged sixty-seven years, from the West Derby Union to Mountmellick Union, Queen's County, was issued by the magistrates sitting at the police court, Dale Street, Liverpool, on the 12th of April last; and, if so, whether he will state how long Milner has resided out of Ireland, and in what capacity he has been employed.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxxiii., 387.

MR. WYNDHAM: The removal warrant referred to was issued on the 25th April. The pauper has not yet been delivered at the Mountmellick Workhouse and the clerk of the union is unable, therefore, to give the information desired in the second part of the Question.

Parish Committees in North Leitrim.

MR. P. A. M'HUGH (Leitrim, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can explain why the Congested Districts Board has up to the present failed to accede to applications made to it from Ballaghamechan and Tullaghan districts in North Leitrim, for the establishment of parish committee schemes; and will he, as President of the Board, see that facilities are afforded in the county of Leitrim to the inhabitants of congested areas who may desire to establish parish committee schemes under the control of the Board.

MR. WYNDHAM: The matter has been referred to the Chief Inspector of the Board for full inquiry and report.

Irish Education Evening School Grants.

MR. SHEEHAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Commissioners of National Education have recently formulated a new rule to the effect that no pupil of fourteen years or upwards attending a day school is to be paid for when he attends a night school; and, if so, whether, in view of the former rule of the Board of Education ordaining that no pupils under fourteen years of age attending a day school could be calculated in attendance at an evening school, he will state if the new rule is retrospective in its action; and will he take steps to secure that it shall not inflict loss on the past session's work to teachers of evening schools in Ireland.

MR. WYNDHAM: The new rule was published in August last and is operative from the commencement of the past session. Its effect is not quite accurately stated. Children between the ages of fourteen and eighteen, who are unable to attend day schools, are eligible as pupils of an evening school and may be taken into account in the calculation of average attendance. No payment, however, is made in respect of a pupil of an evening school who is also paid for as a pupil of a day national school.

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Mr. HALSEY reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Member from the Standing Committee on Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping and Manufactures, Mr. Walter Long; and had appointed in substitution, Mr. Grant Lawson.

Report to lie upon the Table.

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Mr. HALSEY reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had added to the Standing Committee on Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufactures, the following Fifteen Members in respect of the Registration of Clubs (Ireland) Bill:—Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland, Mr. Crean, Sir Thomas Esmonde, Mr. Flynn, Mr. John Gordon, Sir James Haslett, Mr. Hugh Law, Mr. Leamy, Colonel Lockwood, Mr. Lonsdale, Mr. Moore, Mr. Nannetti, Mr. O'Neill, Mr. John Redmond, and Mr. Solicitor-General for Ireland.

Report to lie upon the Table.

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Mr. HALSEY reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had added to the Standing Committee on Law, and Courts of Justice, and Legal Procedure, the following Fifteen Members in respect of the Bishoprics of Southwark and Birmingham Bill:—Mr. A. J. Balfour, Mr. Griffith-Boscawen, Mr. Causton, Mr. Emmott, Mr. Ellis Griffith, Sir John Gorst, Sir William Gurdon, Mr. Hugh Law, Mr. Lowe, Mr. Charles McArthur, Sir Robert Mowbray, Mr. Newdigate, Colonel Sandys, Mr. Austin Taylor, and Mr. Tuff.

Report to lie upon the Table.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES BILL.

Reported, with Amendments, from the Standing Committee on Law, etc.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 166.]

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 166.]

Bill, as amended (in the Standing Committee), to be taken into consideration to-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 191.]

NEW BILL.

CONSTABULARY (IRELAND) BILL.

"To amend The Constabulary (Ireland) Redistribution Act, 1885," presented by Mr. Wyndham; supported by Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 192.]

LICENSING BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on Amendment to Question [9th May], "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Which Amendment was—

"To leave out the word 'now' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day six months.'"—(*Mr. Burt.*)

Question again proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Debate resumed.

*MR. PEEL (Manchester, S.), resuming his speech, which was interrupted at midnight on Monday on the adjourned debate on the Amendment to the Second Reading, said he approached the consideration of the subject not as a teetotaler but as a moderate drinker—in fact, a very moderate drinker—as one whose tendency was towards teetotalism rather than towards occasional insobriety. It was possible that under this Bill the publicans, the actual occupiers of licensed houses, might suffer, because in any case they would have to pay one-fourth of the sum that was to be paid by the trade, and it might happen that the whole amount would have to be provided by them. As their interest in the licences was likely to be small he thought some readjustment was needed in the Bill so that no injustice might be done to these smaller members of the trade.

The main argument against the Bill rested with those who were opposed to compensation in any form. They seemed to rely upon the thin edge of one decision—that in "Sharp *v.* Wakefield"—and to disregard many other legal decisions dealing with the value which attached in various ways to licensed property, and he thought they disregarded also the practice of the Inland Revenue and rating authorities, and went against the conscience of "the man in the street." In regard to compensation there were only two alternatives. There were only two pockets that could be picked, the pocket of the public and the pocket of the publican. With the general acquiescence of both sides of the House the former of these alternatives was ruled out. But as soon as they came to the question of taking compensation out of the licensed trade they fell upon those criticisms which had been passed upon this Bill. To avoid drawing unfairly upon the pocket of the publican there must be some limitation to the amount that would be available for compensation, and, consequently, some limitation upon the discretion of the magistrates in suppressing licences. Some such limitation already existed, for it had never been contended that magistrates had the right to sweep away all or the greater part of the licences in any given area. Where the assessment of a licensed house was small, small also must be the sum payable for the licence if it were taken away. Where the sum was larger they would not measure mathematically the advantage that would be obtained by the reduction of licences by the amount of compensation that had to be paid. The question of the area of authority raised some important points. Many people would have preferred that the compensation fund should have been raised, if it were possible, on a national basis. It was clear that that point exercised the mind of the Government, because the Home Secretary dealt with it in introducing the Bill, and showed conclusively that the difficulties of administration would have been insuperable. As quarter sessions were to be the authorities to raise the money they must have the right to say what number of public-houses, and which houses, should have their licences taken away. If there were any limitation upon the discretion of magistrates in petty sessions, it was traceable to the fact that power must be in the hands of the body which had to raise the fund and regulate its distribution over the area affected. It was interesting to find objections to interference with the magistrates raised by the Opposition. He wondered whether the hon. Member for Northampton had turned his coat and joined the body which was standing up in defence, as they suggested, of the magistrates. Historically it was curious to find that attitude taken up by the Liberal Party. Since the days of the old Liberals of sixty or seventy years ago a great many Liberals had turned to other gods and bowed the knee to other formulæ; but in those days, although it was a Conservative Government which gave what was described as free trade in licences, they were strongly supported by the philosophical Radicals on the ground that it was monstrous to place such power in the hands of magistrates and that every man had a right to do as he liked with his own and to invest his money as he pleased.

He valued the introduction of this Bill, subject to the suggestion which he made on the previous night, because he believed it would introduce a regular and progressive system of reduction in the number of licensed houses. He did not think the contention that the number would not be reduced more rapidly than before was well founded; but, even if it were, there was no guarantee that that reduction would have continued, and under the scheme embodied in the Bill reduction would be distributed more fairly over the whole country. He hoped that the Bill would obtain a Second Reading, and that it would not meet with vigorous and continuous obstruction from what he might call the old temperance party. He admired the members of that party, who had done a great deal of pioneer work, of spade work, in the cause of temperance; but, having done that, he thought they ought to yield the constructive work to those who had not been so much engaged in the early strife. He would remind them that it was David who fought the great struggle, but Solomon who built the Temple. [AN HON. MEMBER: Who is the Solomon in this case?] He would not undertake to reply to that question. A great variety of opinions concerning the licensing question had been expressed by Members of the Opposition, and he doubted whether that Party, if it were in power, could construct a Bill which would satisfy all sections of its adherents. He did not believe the Opposition would be able to attain their ideal, and he asked them, therefore, if they would not be satisfied with something less, and accept this Bill, which would give a steady, continuous, progressive, and, perhaps, a permanent reduction in the number of licensed houses, which he believed they all desired.

*DR. HUTCHINSON (Sussex, Rye) said hon. Members on the opposite side of the House were divided on nearly every subject. Look at this subject. Were they united on it? They might be in their set speeches; but they knew something about them when they were not making set speeches. He approached the subject not as a teetotaler or as a brewer or one interested in breweries, but as one between those extremes, as one belonging to the great body of the public which would have to settle the question and which was neither going to be dictated to by the brewers nor by the teetotalers. They were all agreed that there were too many public-houses, and as a general principle the vast majority of the House agreed to compensation of some sort or another. Personally, he was certainly in favour of a fair system of compensation. But they did not always understand what they were talking about; and therefore it was necessary to give definitions. He defined compensation as a fair equivalent for what was taken away, but his friends opposite defined it as an endowment. In this there was a great difference. They all agreed, too, that this compensation should come out of the trade; but to get money out of the trade they must take away what might otherwise go into the

Exchequer. Therefore, he was not one who raised this objection; he was perfectly content with the way in which the sum was raised, but it was not big enough. He submitted that each party of extremists must make sacrifices if they were to make progress. They must, he added by way of illustration, have a Good Friday before they could have an Easter Sunday. They had to consider whether this proposal was fair first to the public, secondly to the publican, and thirdly to the brewers; and his objection was that it was not fair to the public, because it was an endowment and not an equivalent; that it was not fair to the publican because he paid and did not receive; and that the only man who had a pull out of it was the brewer, who was old enough and rich enough to take care of himself.

He acknowledged the great work done in this age by the teetotalers. They had altered the whole aspect of the nation; they came in and found it a drunken nation; they entered their protest, and it had borne fruit. Their crusade was just like that of the Quakers, who protested against foppishness and who now, having done their work, dressed like ordinary beings. He belonged to a profession which brought a man face to face with the realities of the world and life, and for twenty years he had sat on a county bench, so that he knew something about licensing from that point of view. There was no man of his profession who could not but be struck with the horrors and degradation produced by excessive drinking. He was so impressed with it that he was willing to make a a great deal of sacrifice of his private opinions in order to make progress in temperance work, and he asked other Members to do the same. They could not, however, alter human nature. Christian nations had always drunk and always would do. They had to acknowledge this fact. From the marriage feast at Cana in Galilee down to the last Academy Banquet there had always been drinking. If it were not for that all this trouble would not have arisen. It was so difficult to tell people that a tablespoonful of whisky in a tumbler of Appollinaris would harm them; they could not get people to believe it. Look at gambling. They were all impressed with the horrors of it, but it was difficult to tell a Bishop who played whist at a penny a point with his mother-in-law in the drawing-room that he was imperilling his immortal soul because he was gambling. He would not believe it. Therefore, they had to acknowledge facts as they found them. They could not impress upon the nation that a little drop of drink at meal times did any harm.

What they had to consider was whether the Bill was fair, and he maintained that the compensation clause was not a fair one. Big hotels and restaurants with no earthly chance of ever being closed would have to contribute perpetually thousands a year to a fund out of which they would never get a half-penny. Messrs. Spiers & Pond, for instance, would, he was told, pay some £4,983 a year, and they would get absolutely nothing in exchange. This was not what he considered fair treatment. And what would the publican get out of it? If there was one thing the Bill would do it was that it would drive every publican's vote against the Tory Party at the next general election because they were going to be made to pay, but were not going to be made to receive. The Bill did not make it absolutely certain that the publican would get a single penny. Yet in reality it was more necessary to compensate the publican than it was the brewer, for the latter, having dozens of houses scattered up and down the land, would, when one house was closed, recover the loss out of the increased trade at the other houses. If they turned the poor publican out of his place he had not another house to go into, and he was left absolutely alone, for there was no compensation to be given under the Bill to the first man who should be thought of, namely, the publican. The life of a publican was a precarious one. The business in which he was engaged shortened his life. When a publican applied for a licence his character was inquired into in a way that the character of no parson applying for a church was ever inquired into. His whole past history was gone into, the police were communicated with, and if there was a single flaw in his character the licence was refused. The hon.

Member for Morpeth said he would not go in for such a microscopic inquiry into his past.

There were many anomalies that might have been got rid of by this Bill. What would this Bill do in regard to tied houses? It did absolutely nothing for them except to make them more tied than ever. The Government could have put in a small clause similar to one which he had drafted. He would give it to the Government and make no charge for it—

> "Any house that is tied, on account of its being tied, will forfeit its licence."

That would put a stop to the system to-morrow. He wished to see the publican and the public get fair treatment in this matter, but it was only the brewer the Government had taken into consideration. He and his friends were willing to agree to compensation paid by the trade. They were willing even to allow Parliamentary sanction for it, but it must be compensation which was fair all round, remembering that the value of a new licence belonged to the public. Another objection to the Bill was that the sum calculated was too small. It would not make any appreciable reduction in the number. Of course they all knew that figures were only used as illustrations. They had yesterday afternoon an interesting example of that. The hon. Member for the Spen Valley Division told the House that there were only a few hundred pounds for each licensing division. Another Gentleman who was on the Royal Commission made out that there were thousands and tens of thousands. That only showed that they could get figures to do what they liked. He was quite sure that the sum which would be available would be nothing like adequate to make the reduction required. In his own small village, extending to three quarters of a mile, and having 1,000 inhabitants, there were nine licensed "on" houses. Six of these ought to be reduced. The whole sum of these houses came to £31 a year. That was only one village in a large quarter-sessional district. There were hundreds of villages, and they might multiply the difficulty as many times. How long it would take to shut up these houses on £31 a year he would leave to the Chancellor of the Exchequer or some other gentleman to calculate. If he gave support to this Bill he must have some assurance that there was going to be a time limit, or some system of insurance which would make the thing permanent. He thought compensation should be paid out in the same proportion as that in which it was paid in, and that the amount issued should be dependent on the number of reductions and not *vice versa*. He thought that was one of the most important things they would have to consider.

With regard to the question of the magistrates, he had no severe criticisms to make. He thought that in many ways they might come to terms on the question of the magistrates. In the county boroughs, for instance, he did not see that there was any great hardship, and he thought they would get a pull out of this Bill through not having to appeal to quarter sessions. In regard to the county divisions he could not say that it was a very great hardship on them to go to quarter sessions to sanction the reduction of licences so long as they had the appeal as provided for at the present moment. Every petty sessional division should have one of the magistrates placed on the licensing committee. He thought if the Government would accept that suggestion it would lessen a good deal of the friction. He agreed that difficulty came in when they came to the non-county boroughs. Take the non-county borough of Tunbridge in which he was interested. There they had a very efficient borough bench. They could inquire into the necessities of their borough. The borough was in two counties—one part in Kent and the other part in Sussex—so that they had two quarter-sessional divisions to go to if they wanted any of the licences reduced. He would suggest that under Clause 5 where there was a chance for sub-dividing areas each of the non-county boroughs should be made a little centre of its own, and that each should settle its affairs in its own way without having to go to the county magistrate who knew absolutely nothing about the borough. As to the question whether the lessening of the number of public-houses would decrease drunkenness, he thought there could not be the slightest doubt that it would. Let them look at what had been done in Liverpool and Birmingham. They could not get over the fact that by lessening the number of public-houses they reduced the number of convictions for drunkenness. But they must go further and introduce changes for improving the condition of those who were not comfortably housed, comfortably clothed, and comfortably fed. They must deal with those who lived in the slums by improving the housing accommodation. They must get the people back to the land. Here was this Government in office, and in power, all these years, and they had not gone down to the bottom of these things. They wanted the Government to propose alterations dealing with the land laws, land values, and things of that sort. Then they would be able to make some progress in regard to these great social questions. This Bill which was only giving compensation to the brewers would receive opposition from the impartial men on that side of the House. Hon. Members laughed at the reference to impartial men. There were such things about. They would find then scattered all over the country if they went outside the House. These were questions which really went to the root of the matter, and unless concessions were made on the lines he had mentioned he would oppose the Bill at every stage.

*Mr. WORSLEY-TAYLOR (Lancaster, Blackpool) said it was only the principle of the Bill with which he proposed to deal. He agreed entirely that there were a number of details of very considerable difficulty and importance, both with regard to the interests in these houses and of the public, which would need very careful scrutiny and examination in Committee. It was his intention to support the Bill on the Second Reading. He had heard with great interest certain criticisms with regard to quarter sessions. He had regularly attended quarter sessions for twenty years, and it was at them that his attention had been called to the licensing laws. He was sure that no one who had sat there, or in petty sessions, could fail to have been impressed, and deeply impressed, with the crime and misery which had undoubtedly followed from excess of drink. His experience there had led him to the hope that some measure such as the present Bill would be passed, because he firmly believed it would facilitate the reduction of licences. Everybody who had spoken had agreed that some reduction was necessary. Such a reduction was necessary in certain places partly in order that there might be less temptation; but it would have an even greater effect than that, because by it they would be able to remove the lowest class of insanitary drinking dens which were the curse of the neighbourhood in which they were situated. The holders of the better houses would not be deterred by undue competition from carrying on an honest trade, and the public would be able to claim from them even greater regard in the due performance of the conditions of their licences. It was his earnest desire that due and reasonable reductions should take place; and the reason he supported the Bill was because he thought it would undoubtedly facilitate that reduction. He did not support it in the interests of the trade, but he thought it did justice to the trade which was a lawful one and therefore entitled to justice. The two great cardinal difficulties at present in regard to the reduction of licences were, first, that there was no compensation where houses were suppressed solely in the public interest; and second, that there was no power over 1869 Act houses. These were two cardinal principles, the two crucial points dealt with in the Bill. He had not formed that opinion, or expressed it, simply for the purposes of this Bill. He ventured to say that many of the regular attendants at quarter sessions had come to the like conclusion. He would like to read a paragraph from a resolution passed unanimously four years ago by the quarter sessions of which he was a member—

"We wish unanimously to express our sympathy with the licensing committee in their desire to abate the evils of intemperance, and so bring about due and reasonable regulation of the number and class of licensed houses in the borough. We venture, also unanimously, to express the hope that Parliament may be able shortly to deal with the whole question of the licensing laws, and particularly with the crucial points prominently arising in this case, viz:—(1) that of the terms on which the number of licensed houses should be reduced when that is done solely in the public interest, and (2) that of larger control over the renewal of licences of 1869 beerhouses, as we consider that the present state of matters with regard to these two points places serious difficulties in the way of licensing justices and Courts of quarter sessions, who desire to deal with a great problem on broad and equitable lines."

He thought that that showed that these justices, thus assembled in quarter sessions, and dealing with matters of licensing, were actuated by a desire to procure due and reasonable regulation and reduction of licences; and secondly, that they were actuated by a desire not to find themselves in antagonism with the local justices; but to be able to work with them. He hoped and believed that some of the provisions of the Bill would tend to decrease the friction which had hitherto at times occurred between the quarter sessions and the local justices. In the first place the great difficulty which at present existed was the taking away a licence without compensation because it was felt that to do so would be to do a serious injustice to the individual owner and occupier of the house. The question of compensation was the bone of contention and the Bill removed it. He believed also that the provision which obliged the quarter sessions to deal with this matter through a committee would introduce a more judicial spirit. His belief was, after an experience of twenty years, that those justices who habitually attended quarter sessions attempted honestly to deal with these questions in a judicial spirit. He deprecated and deplored—he did not care from which side of politics these justices came—that some came only occasionally and for a special purpose, that was, when there was a question of licences. He remembered very well a case which had been under consideration for some time by the sessions of which he happened to be chairman. He said to his brother justices that he desired to put before them the crucial points, in order that they might come to a judicial decision, when he was told by one of the gentlemen who came there *ad hoc*: "We have not come here to argue, but to vote, and no doubt he had come to support the opinion of the local justices." That kind of thing would not happen if there was a committee of quarter sessions to deal with the licences; and therefore one source of friction and heartburning would be avoided. There was another provision of the Bill which would tend in the same direction; and that was that instead of having to overrule, as at present, the formal decision of the local justices, always an unpleasant position, the committee of quarter sessions would have before them a report, equally effective but less in the nature of litigation. He looked forward also to the other provision that in case of difference of opinion there might be consultation between the quarter sessions' committee and the local justices. If, as he hoped, that provision could be harmonised with the position of quarter sessions as a court of appeal, he believed this Bill, preserving, as it did, the initiative of the local justices, would tend to decrease friction and introduce that cordial and sympathetic co-operation between the local justices and the quarter sessions, which could not exist so long as the present state of things continued.

A few words as to compensation. The hon. Member for Morpeth the previous day had said, in plain terms, that he denied that there was any title, legal, moral, or equitable, to any form of compensation. He would deal first with the case of the fully-licensed houses. He agreed that there was in that case no legal title. But he would remind hon. Members that in the House of Commons they were not sitting as a Court of law, but as a Court of equity—the highest Court of equity in the kingdom. When they looked at the way in which the State had dealt with this case, viz., that so long as the licensed premises were well-conducted, there had been, in fact, reasonable expectation that the licence would be renewed; when it rated them not as on a tenancy for one year, but as a going concern from year to year with a reasonable expectation of renewal from year to year; when they looked at the fact that the State levied death duties on these properties, sometimes on a capital value of twenty years purchase, and therefore taking, in the case of a 10 per cent. estate, two full years value—when they looked at all these facts, then he held that the State was estopped from denying that there was a moral and equitable case for compensation. But there was the case of the ante-1869 houses. The hon. Member opposite said that there was no property in these licences and therefore no legal claim to compensation. Surely, that argument implied that if there was property there would be a legal claim to compensation. True, the owners of the ante-1869 beerhouses had to go year by year before the licensing justices for the purpose of bringing themselves and their houses under review as to whether they had complied with the conditions of the law. But if they proved that, then no objection could be taken to them, then the statute said, in plain terms, that the licence should as of right and law be granted one year more and should be renewed from year to year further. The result was that the owners of these ante-1869 licences had a right to renewal of their licences in perpetuity. He had never yet known in thirty years experience before Committees of the House of a case in which property of that kind was taken away by the public in the interest of the public, without full and adequate compensation being granted by Parliament. He ventured to say more, that where property of that kind—for he called it property—was taken by the public for the purposes of the public, the compensation came out of the public funds; and he maintained that if the owners of the ante-1869 licences had elected to put their claim on that basis, hon. Gentlemen opposite would have had no answer to it. But these ante-1869 licences did not drive their case to that extremity. They said, "We are willing to come in as part of a general bargain and take our chance. We are willing to put ourselves absolutely under the control of the licensing justices, and to take our share in this scheme of compulsory insurance for the benefit of the people of our class and of the fully-licensed house owners." He suggested that when that offer was made, it was a fair and liberal offer, and that it should induce a sympathetic treatment in connection with the rest of the bargain. He submitted that with regard to the ante-1869 licences there was a legal claim to compensation; and that with regard to the other houses there was an equitable claim. He had said that he supported the principle of the Bill, because it would facilitate the reduction of licensed houses which could not take place at present, for the following reasons. There were 30,000 ante-1869 licences in existence at present, or more; and everyone who had experience of licensing matters would agree that many of these 30,000 were the first which ought to go, because they were the worst and lowest class of houses, and would make the smallest inroad on the compensation money on account of their small value. He had the strongest illustration in this regard in a scheme formulated by the justices of a borough in his own quarter sessional area, who had for years taken a keen interest in the licensing question. They proposed to select for extinction a certain number of licences, not exceeding twelve, out of 121 in the borough. It was also stated that the houses would be selected from the ante-1869 beerhouses in the older and less reputable parts of the town in which there were the most cases of drunkenness and disorder. Those justices declared that it was necessary to remove twelve of the ante-1869 beerhouses, but they could not touch one. It was only through the instrumentality of this Bill that they could be taken away. He knew that magistrates had been driven to expedients which were regrettable. He had heard it admitted that opposition had been offered to a fully licensed house, not because there was any objection to that house, but because the owner of the house was also the owner of an ante-1869 beerhouse which the justices wanted to get rid of; and they objected to the fully-licensed house in order to bring pressure on the owner to give up the ante-1869 beerhouse. That was a strong case. No doubt the justices thought that they were justified in the end aimed at; but he regretted the means adopted; and also the state of the law which induced gentlemen in pursuit of a good end to resort to an expedient of that kind. If this Bill did nothing else than for the first time to bring under full control the ante-1869 beerhouses it would be the greatest step in the cause of temperance which had been made for many a long year.

With regard to the other houses, he desired to point out that the difficulties were not so great, but they were certainly most serious. Could they get in regard to them a scheme which should be comprehensive, certain, and simple in application? He maintained that they could get more of those conditions. Suppose there were half-a-dozen houses in a limited area, and that the local justices decided to get rid of one. They were not always particular which one it was. They selected one house for extinction, and immediately the argument was put forward, "Why this house? why not one of the others?" Very often that argument succeeded, because there was no answer to it; as there was no reason to take one house rather than another. But that argument was got rid of by compensation. Again, everyone might agree that a certain house was superfluous, but then the further point arose that it was a very hard thing to deprive the owner of that house, of his property, when no objection could be taken to him. They might have two cases side by side at the same quarter sessions and on the same day. In one case there might be every possible objection to the house. It might be a bad house, badly conducted, frequented by bad characters, with constant changes of tenants, and a long list of convictions. Neither owner nor tenant had fulfilled the conditions on which he obtained his licence, and, therefore, his licence was taken away. Then you might get an absolutely contrary case in every respect. The house might be suitable in itself, well conducted, might supply food as well as drink, might be frequented by the most respectable people, the superintendent of the police might not have a word to say against the holder of the licence, the house might have been held by the same family for generations. Yet the magistrates were called upon to mete out to the holder of that licence the same ruin and disaster as they had to mete out to the man who had violated every condition on which he had received his licence. That was contrary to human nature, and there was a good deal of human nature about quarter sessions. Want of compensation prevented reduction. At present they were in this dilemma—if they suppressed a licence solely on the ground of non-requirement they did it with the knowledge that they would be inflicting ruin on the innocent owner—if they renewed it, they refused reduction where they might agree in the view of the local justices that some reduction was desirable. That was a cruel dilemma and many of them who had sat at quarter sessions had felt it. This Bill would remove that dilemma; and he certainly would record his vote in favour of its principle.

He agreed with the hon. Gentleman opposite who said that there was a vast consensus of opinion in favour of the principle of some form of compensation. He submitted also that this was a scheme of compulsory insurance by the trade and for the trade; and, therefore, he ventured to submit with great deference to the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition that that came within the definition he had given of the conditions under which he would be willing to see compensation given. The right hon. Gentleman disagreed with this Bill because it was a Bill, and said it ought to be voluntary and administered by the trade. He, however, would submit that it could never be carried out by voluntary arrangement. The only way to proceed was by a Bill of this character. He was under the impression that the right hon. Gentleman would not have taken objection to the proposal on the only or main ground that it was embodied in a Bill before Parliament; because he had been gratified in reading the election address of the right hon. Gentleman before the present Parliament was elected. After referring to local option, the right hon. Gentleman said—

> "Opinion in England may not be prepared for so great a change."

He, himself, did not think that opinion in England wanted that kind of home rule in drink any more than it wanted home rule in regard to other matters. Then the right hon. Gentleman proceeded—

> "But even then much good might be done by a gradual reduction of licences under improved local authorities, and this salutary reform would be greatly facilitated if it were admitted, perfectly consistently with the denial of any right to public compensation, that the persons injuriously affected should receive reasonable recognition of their loss out of funds to be provided by the trade themselves.

That was this Bill. Then he continued—

> "I shall welcome the day when a measure conceived on those lines will take a foremost place among Parliamentary projects."

Here was the day, here the measure, and he respectfully invited the right hon. Gentleman to give it a less exuberant welcome than he had threatened on the First Reading.

For the reasons he had given he would support the Second Reading of the Bill, which he believed would make for the public interest, having due regard to the rights of individuals.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): I am sure the House has listened with the greatest pleasure to the speech just delivered by my hon. and learned friend. I think he said that this was the first occasion on which he had addressed the House; but perhaps I may refer to the fact that our pleasure is mingled with sorrow because, if what we have read in the newspapers is true, the hon. and learned Member does not intend to continue a Member of this House when the dissolution occurs. His is just the sort of speech to which the House of Commons likes to listen. The hon. and learned Gentleman put with a clearness which almost fascinated the House a statement of his views, and showed us that those views were founded on his own personal knowledge of what he was speaking about. There may have been something of the art of the advocate, but it was pleasantly and ingeniously concealed. The hon. Gentleman at once gained our sympathy by attacking parts of the present system which are interfered with by the Bill, and parts of the present system to which we are as much opposed as he is. For instance, he spoke of the ante-1869 beerhouses. We quite agree with him that the position of those houses is a very unfortunate one for the public, and that great scandals occur amongst them; but what the hon. and learned Gentleman by supporting this Bill is going to do is that he is going to place the ante-1869 beerhouses in the same position as the other houses. The hon. and learned Member spoke of quarter sessions and what an advantage it would be to have their authority in this matter administered by a committee rather than by the whole body of magistrates. There again I, at least, agree with him, because nothing could be more absurd and really more subversive of any equitable proceeding in the matter than what he spoke of—not the casual or accidental, but the irregular attendance of the justices who came to vote but not to discuss. The hon. Member for Manchester taunted us with the fact that we have become such fanatical admirers and supporters of petty sessions. The declaration of my creed in the matter, which the hon. and learned Gentleman has done me the honour first of all to dig out and secondly to quote, explains my view on the question. We are in favour of an improved local authority, but above all let the authority be a local authority; that is the point upon which we insist. The hon. and learned Gentleman may be sure that I shall say nothing that in the least contradicts any word of what I may call the admirable definition of my opinions on the subject which he quoted to the House.

Before proceeding to deal with the merits of the Bill I think it would not be out of place, and it might be useful, for us to consider what the real state of things is to which the Bill is applied. What is the case for the Bill? We have heard a great many speeches which seem to imply that this is a Bill whose main and prime object is to facilitate the reduction of public-houses. Why, it is nothing of the sort, by the confession of the Prime Minister himself. It is alleged or assumed that the magistrates have been taking violent and ill-considered action in the exercise of their powers, resulting in the confiscation of private property, in the displacement of a high class of licensed victualler, in the ruin of some individuals, and in loss and shock to the whole body of investors. That is the case, and this Bill is intended to cure it—to prevent magistrates from doing these dreadful things. If the magistrates had not taken action there would have been no Bill. Let us inquire what is it that the magistrates have done? I am not going back into the question of the nature of a licence and the powers in this matter of the magistrates, because I imagine that is conceded on all hands. It is not only conceded to be the law, but to have been known to be the law for the last thirteen years. And it is during these thirteen years that the great brewers have been buying up public-houses on all hands and floating companies and putting them upon the public to the extent, I have seen it calculated, of £90,000,000 sterling, with this "Sharpe *v.* Wakefield" case and all the rest of it staring them in the face. And I can only say as to the investor, that while we do not wish to be hard on anyone who invests his money reasonably, yet it is too much to come forward and say that while they were fully alive to the profits they would make they were somehow strangely blind to the risks they ran.

Last year, as we all remember, a deputation representing the principal bodies connected with the liquor trade came to the Prime Minister, and this is what he told them. He said that "the trade was subjected to a very serious and, as I think, a very unjust strain" in the action of the magistrates. Insecurity was wrought in every branch of the trade; gross injustice had been put on a large number of individuals. "I regret," he said, "that that which was a legitimate investment is regarded as an investment no longer, or seriously worth regarding as an investment"; and he described the action of the justices as but little short in its practical effect of injustice and confiscation of property. That was the right hon. Gentleman's *résumé* of the action of the licensing justices in this country for some years back. The right hon. Gentleman sometimes rebukes other people for exaggeration of language, but his language in this matter is surely a little exaggerated. He completed this anthology by declaring in the House of Commons that compensation in the case of superfluous licences "has been a publicly announced part of the creed and belief of those with whom I habitually act in politics." And further, in this House in April last year he said, "Unless you have an unlimited fund it is absolutely necessary to fetter the discretion of the magistrates." Let the House bear this in mind—unless you have an unlimited fund it is absolutely necessary to fetter the discretion of the magistrates. Now in this Bill and in its provisions there is no unlimited fund—there is a very limited fund—but there is unlimited fettering of the discretion of the magistrates.

What is it that these wicked magistrates have done? What are the reductions that they made last year? Some of the figures have been given to the House before, but it is well to keep them in our minds. There are 991 licensing districts in England and Wales. Of the county divisions in 629 instances there was no case of the renewal of a licence being refused, and that was also true of 169 boroughs. In all there were only 193 divisions in which licences were touched at all, and of these in 103 only a single licence was touched, in thirty-two there were two, in seventeen three, and only in ten throughout the country were there more than three. These figures include non-renewals for all causes, and in the aggregate they amount, on and off-licences together, to 639 non-renewals. Of course, what the Bill is primarily concerned with, is refusals for non-requirement, as they are called. There were 220 such cases, on and off, confined to 62 out of 991 licensing divisions; 220 cases out of 100,000 licences! That is the extent of this terrible inroad upon property, security, and morality of which the magistrates have been guilty, and which is put forward as the excuse for proceeding against them in this Bill. Were the reductions made rashly, cruelly, inconsiderately? No, Sir. In three or four cases where it was done on any great scale, and where there might be a possible presumption of rashness, it was the result of the most patient, personal, conscientious investigation carried on within the letter and spirit of the law, and subject, of course, to the check of quarter sessions. And what were the circumstances? The most remarkable and conspicuous cases of action were in districts where it was notorious that licences were enormously in excess of what was required; they were known as congested drink districts, neighbourhoods, in fact, soddened with drink. Take as a type the Floodgate Street area in the city of Birmingham. This district has been elaborately examined for some years by philanthropic and disinterested persons. The population is about 7,000; there is a public-house for every 89 adults. The Poor Law guardians issued in six months 227 orders for the workhouse, in addition to medical and outrelief. In 1903 there were 307 cases admitted to the workhouse; 193 children were sent to the children's hospital; there were eighteen inquests by the coroner. The year before, 625 persons were admitted to the general hospital, 500 required surgical aid; nine persons were sent to the lunatic asylum. It was estimated that out of the 7,000 population 2,500 came on the rates or received charitable help within one year. Now that is the sort of place in which the hands of the local magistrates are to be stayed, while the ratepayers and the charitable people are, I suppose, to help as well as they can the wrecks that are turned out by the drinking shops and to feed and clothe the children of these demoralised parents. The magistrates here were prepared to act quietly and tentatively, but there came a paralysing blast from above. The Prime Minister made a speech; it was known that the Government was going to move; therefore the magistrates did not think it necessary to interfere. They renewed the whole number of the licences, and, therefore, even if this Bill does not pass, and things remain as they were, a year at least has been added to the full life of this moral and physical Gehenna. In that state of things, and in the attempt of the magistrates to deal with it, and the manner in which they have dealt with it, you must find the origin of the Bill.

We may have different views as to the objects intended by the Government in this Bill, but its effects at least are perfectly clear. Its immediate broad effect is to confirm licence holders in their concessions in perpetuity and to confer a gigantic endowment upon the liquor trade. Its ultimate effect will be to prevent any real serious reform of the licensing system. It is a Bill for conferring a monopoly established for the protection of the public into a private monopoly for the enjoyment of individuals. It accomplishes this by the two-fold method of meddling with the powers and procedure of the magistrates and setting up a system of compensation which, although the hon. and learned Gentleman recommends it as facilitating the reduction of licences, yet I think may have the very opposite effect and be a barrier and a hindrance to it. I take first the changes proposed in the licensing authority. There is no suggestion, if you keep compensation out of sight for the moment, that the intention is to facilitate the reduction of licences or increase efficiency. The sole effect will be to check reduction. The men who are capable of judging as to local requirements are deposed, and the only method calculated to give effect to their judgment—namely, the administrative method, is abolished. Quarter sessions will sit as a Court. The present licensing justices are confined to reporting; the powers of initiative and of dealing with groups of licences are taken from them. If that is so, it is a strange thing that one body will have the initiative and no power, and the other will have power but no initiative. In practice a vital part of the licensing law is repealed, and that is the part which gives the justices on the spot freedom of administrative action and of judicial discretion. And, as if to emphasise the arbitrary character of this retrograde change, the very persons who are refused this discretion and power are left in the full exercise of their power in all cases of misconduct, of which, surely, they are no more capable than they are in the other case. If the lack of compensation is the bar to the extinction of licences, why, when compensation is forthcoming, do you meddle with magistrates at all?

Let us turn to the scheme of compensation. It is, of course, plausible and ingenious, and calculated to attract the casual onlooker, but it behoves us to look below the surface, and then we find one or two awkward facts. First of all, this is public money, and not trade money. Yet it is to be called a trade fund, and there is an optional operation which must have an effect in checking the active exercise of the powers of the magistrates. There is the amount of the levy, which circumscribes the power of the magistrates, because it is the measure of the extent of the reduction, and the Bill, in prescribing compensation, limits its application still further by inflating the values of licences. Let us look at this in conjunction with the alteration in procedure, and in the power of the licensing magistrates. Whatever we may think of compensation in the abstract these proposals will be found to be a part of the pinioning process as applied to magistrates in the exercise of what hitherto have been their functions. What is the measure of value on which this levy is to be founded? Supposing a certain public-house is worth £5,000 altogether, and £2,000 is the value of the house without the licence, then £3,000 is what the licensee is to receive. You take this monopoly value as the standard of compensation, and you say when A, the publican, is bought out, the equities of the case are discharged. A is satisfied; the trade is satisfied; the promoters of this Bill are satisfied. Why, then, should any one complain? But look a little ahead. There are others besides A. Supposing in this particular locality there are fifty public-houses, of which nine others besides A's ought to be reduced. You will find out that in buying out A, instead of extinguishing £3,000 monopoly value, you are merely distributing the greater part of it over the others, and when you come to deal with the others, you will have to buy out a proportion of it again when you come to B in his turn, and so on through C, D, and the rest with accumulated increment as you go down or up the scale, until at last the value of the ten extinguished licences, or the great part of it reaches the hands of the residuary legatees—namely, the forty other licensed holders who are left. If we are to believe what is said on behalf of the trade that the volume of drink consumed will not be diminished at all by any reduction of licences, then, of course, the whole would be treated in this way. I put it more moderately. I say that the extinction of licences by compensation, is an endowment to the surving licensees, and that for every one extinguished the next one will be more costly. In a word, the entire scheme of compensation is fallacious, and will operate for the maintenance, and not for the extinction, of licences. You are going to pay the owner of a tied house, wholesale and retail profits, and to indemnify him and the *bonâ fide* publican at the same rate; You propose to proceed without regard to any saving of maintenance and of cost to those which remain, without regard to the question whether the trade was carried on by legitimate or illegitimate means, and without question also of the quality of the drink supplied. And to crown all, the appeal on values is to be to Somerset House, and it is directed to arrive at the value in the same way as for estate duty—that is to say, the maximum valuation. Here we have the Government in this position, that the law has decided that a licence is for one year only, and not a freehold. Somerset House has taken a view somewhat different. The Government say that the decision of the Supreme Court of the realm is not to settle the matter, but that they will borrow the method of the Department and apply it in this Act of Parliament. I think that is a strong order.

And now having established and endowed the trade in the aggregate, who is to get the compensation? An agreement is to be come to between the parties interested in the premises. But if they do not agree, what happens? The question is to be submitted to quarter sessions. That is a very wise decision in their own interest on the part of the Government. They meet a Gordian knot; they do not untie nor even cut it; they pass it on to quarter sessions. In these days of unification and co-ordination one of the most complicated problems conceivable is to be submitted for solution to each body of magistrates to settle as they please. I suspect the results will be interesting and entertaining. I know a good many magistrates, and, have had experience of some Benches—not in any objectionable way—and it will not be surprising if some of them come to the conclusion that the optional character of this procedure is that which recommends it most to their approval. After all, if they want a quiet life all they have to do is to leave the thing alone, and I am much mistaken if the policy of masterly inactivity will not be that which they will follow. But what then comes of the reduction of licences? And how on earth is that Court which chooses the more strenuous course to adjudicate between the claims of landlord and tenant, the brewer and his agent, the mortgagor and mortgagee, and a dozen other baffling combinations? It is a matter of common belief that there are sometimes strange covenants between the brewer and the tied houses. All these nice little problems and conditions will form a maze into which quarter sessions are to be flung. My theory, on principle, is that the State should have nothing to do with this question of either levy or apportionment. One thing at least is clear, that the publican himself in a tied house will get nothing at all. At present, I understand, he never gets compensation when a licence is transferred behind his back. I am told that there are about 20,000 of these transfers every year promoted by the brewers. If this were generally realised, and it were seen what a slight value—when he is not a politician, but a man in business—the brewer puts on the claim we now hear so much of from the publicans, I think the bottom would be knocked out of the entire agitation. The publican's position under the Bill will be worse, because the magistrates at present have power in making a transfer to impose conditions, and this power goes out under the present Bill.

I have shown why the Bill, its changes in the licensing authority and its scheme of compensation, will have a fatal effect on the diminution of licences which we all sincerely desire. But is this not the oddest thing in this Bill that you may examine it from one corner to the other and you will not find any reference to the interest of the public? Public rights are handed over without any sort of equivalent. In no single case are they asserted or adjusted to the new circumstances. It might almost be supposed that the Government, or the authors of the Bill, whoever they may be, have brought themselves to believe that the licensing system was originally devised in the interest of the trade, and that any encroachments made upon its privileges in the public interest are wrongful and are in the nature of confiscation. But these provisions ought at least to extort the enthusiastic admiration of the Tariff Reform League and the protectionists in this House, if there are any in these days of avoidance without confession. The Bill is the very glorification and apotheosis of monopoly. I could almost imagine the brewers bringing themselves into the habit of identifying His Majesty's Government with one of their own tied houses. There is a strange resemblance. The goodwill of this tied Government is worth a good deal of money to the brewers, and the brewers can make some return for it. The non-renewal of licence of this tied Government, whether on the ground of misconduct or of non-requirement in the public interest, would be a sad loss to the trade. If this Bill were to pass it means the capitulation of the State to the trade.

Let me enumerate one or two points to make good what I have said that there has been an ignoring, in effect a betrayal, of the public interest in the framing of the Bill. The whole Bill, indeed, is a betrayal. Take its financial aspect. Public money is taken and is attached for this purpose which in the ordinary course of things might have gone into the Exchequer, and ought to have gone into the Exchequer, and come back to the localities in relief of their rates. Does the Government think that the localities have no counter-claim at all against this great trade which depreciates property, which demoralises the people, and adds to the burden of the ratepayer and the taxpayer? Do not they see that this Bill is in effect a fresh raid on the rates in the way I have described in the interest of this burdensome monopoly, and that it takes the ratepayer in fact fore and aft, in front and rear, because it makes him forego a source of revenue to which he was entitled to look forward, and at the same time it quarters upon him a concessionnaire to whom a freehold, not to say a leasehold, is given. But the public does not get a look in under this Bill. Not only is the public direct interest in the local body of magistrates removed, but the public are not represented before quarter sessions. The whole thing is done behind their back, and that is surely a bad consequence of the suppression of local discretion. You take away from the local magistrates the discretionary power they have. The weapon they have is their power of refusing renewal in all cases, not of flagrant misconduct, but of simple abuse in public-houses. The fact that they had the power of taking away a licence and of refusing renewal was a great instrument of public order and decency. But here is an alteration made of a very important character. Justices are now required, if they take away a licence from a man because of misconduct, to notify specifically to the applicant the grounds for non-renewal. The premises may be ill-conducted, they may be insufficient and unsuitable; there is the character and the fitness of the licensee. Those are the only points to which their notice of the grounds of objection must be confined. I have here recorded a large number of offences not amounting to flagant, positive misconduct which the magistrates have been accustomed to keep in view in dealing with renewal licences. They are defective or lax management as distinguished from ill-conduct, irregular opening, offering attractions to induce custom, selling drink on credit, the encouragement of the slate club, giving the "long pull," giving free drinks at Christmas, failure to supply solid refreshments, allowing the house to be the resort of young girls. In all there are twenty-two offences recorded here from which we are now protected if the justices find them a ground for non-renewal. The powers of the magistrates do enable them to insist on the abandonment of these practices, but now that power is to be taken away. Whatever views we may hold on the subject, whether we are teetotalers or that class whom I heard described as "moderate drunkards," this Bill has nothing to do with temperance or licences. It is an attack on the right of self-protection and self-government of the community; and with such issues it is deplorable that there should be any difference of opinion or judgment in the House. Those issues affect the self-respect and character of every parish in the land, and this should appeal to us as the representatives of the people.

Some persons approve the principle of the Bill. I want to know what is the principle of the Bill? I saw the other day that there was a meeting of the Church of England Temperance Society in one diocese which refused to join in a demonstration because they approved the principle of the Bill and asked for various Amendments. The hon. and learned Member spoke of the principle of the Bill. What is the principle? Is it a reduction of the rate of extinction, because it seems to me to do that? Is it an endowment of the trade? It is a crippling of the magistrates' power? Is it compensation in the abstract? Surely we may distinguish between compensation in any form or degree which would have the effect of facilitating reduction and that by which the compensation so administered will have the opposite effect. The hon. Member for South Derbyshire the other day at a meeting of the Licenced Victuallers' Protection Society thought that it would not be wise to reject the Bill. It required amending, but in it he said they found the great principle that the licensed owner's property was his own, and if it was to be taken away he was to be paid for it; the Bill indeed contained the valuable principle for which they had struggled so long. That was the hon. Member's estimate of the principle. I do not know why the Bill should go any further. We have it on the confession and expressed opinion of the Government and otherwise that the trade has ample resources to indemnify itself. The licensed victualler under the Bill will in nine cases out of ten in the tied houses receive no benefit at all. The tenth man, the free licensed victualler outside, can insure and does insure, and he wants nothing. It is the Government who have stepped forward and said, "Never mind the public, let us look at the interests of the trade." Why should the State entangle itself in this matter at all? Why should we assist this great, powerful, wealthy trade in the country by giving it further millions and large potentialities enabling it to exploit for all time and without restraint a monopoly which belongs to the State? That is the point on which we join issue, and in the interests of the public health, comfort, and welfare we refuse the demand.

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL (Sir EDWARD CARSON, Dublin University): I desire to associate myself with the observations of the Leader of the Opposition with reference to the speech of my hon. and learned friend the Member for Blackpool. Those of us who belong to the same profession as the hon. Member have long known of his great ability, and we feel regret that even in the short time he has been a Member of this House he has not often given us the opportunity of hearing him. So far as I am concerned, I would be very well content to leave the statement of the case for the Bill in the speech of the hon. and learned Member for Blackpool, because that speech, which was closely reasoned, and which was based on actual facts and actual experience, has not been answered in any one single detail by the speech of the right hon. Gentleman who has just spoken. It has occurred to me as a strange phenomenon in the course of this debate that, while we are attempting to do something to settle a controversy which has now raged for something like thirty years, the only outcome and suggestion of the speeches opposite, and especially that of the speech of the Leader of the Opposition to which we have just listened, is that we should leave things exactly as they are. During the last few days in such time as I had at my disposal I took some enjoyment in looking through the history of this question as it is to be found in the records of this House. I found Resolution after Resolution, Bill after Bill, a division this way one time and another way at another time, and I recollected that at almost every election since I can remember we have had the same test questions put to candidates on both sides of the House. Here we are, after all these years, both of us absolutely agreed that something ought to be done to check temperance. [OPPOSITION laughter and cheers.] I am glad that so small a matter can raise a cheer. And what is more, both sides of the House have been all along agreed, and we are now agreed, that the number of licensed houses in almost every district in the country is excessive, and yet we have been unable to make any progress—I say deliberately, any progress—in the legislation of this country for the last thirty years with the view to doing something for amending a state of things which we all deplore.

The right hon. Gentleman who has just addressed us has, I think, if his argument is sifted, absolutely condemned the existing state of affairs. I mean by that not merely the present existence of too large a number of licensed houses, but the present procedure, and the present action of the magistrates. Why, Sir, what is the fact? It seems to me to be the very strongest argument for the Bill now before the House. During all these past years under the existing system it is claimed for the magistrates that they had absolute discretion, and that they had the power of decreasing these public-houses. I ask, if that is so, why have they not been decreased? Is not that the very strongest argument that there must be something at the back of the system which prevents, not merely isolated benches of magistrates whom you might say were cowardly or were afraid, but the whole magistracy throughout the country, from doing what is said to be their duty? And what is the evidence we have that that is so? I take the statement of the right hon. Gentleman who has just addressed us. He has told us that out of 991 licensing districts last year, only in regard to one licence in each of sixty-two of those districts had there been any interference by the magistrates for the reduction of licensed houses at all on public grounds. That, after all, is the matter we are dealing with. If that is so, I ask, is it because in those 991 districts there are not too many public-houses that the magistrates have not interfered? Of course it must be admitted that that is not so. I remember the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Monmouthshire, when he was Chancellor of the Exchequer, introducing his Bill in 1895. I remember him giving an account of an interview he had with some of the magistrates. I think they were from the county of Kent. Here is what he told us—

> "I remember an occasion when the magistrates came as a body to me and asked me to do something to put down the excess of public-houses in the county. I said, 'It is astonishing that you should come to me, because you are the persons who have licensed these houses and who can discontinue doing so.' They replied that such action on their part would be very unpopular, and I said, 'Then what you desire is that I should accept the unpopularity.'"

Yes, Sir, that is the truth of the matter, that this House is asking the magistrates to do what this House itself dare not, and what this House itself would not venture to do, namely, to lay down that the owners of these licensed premises ought to be evicted from their holdings without a single penny of compensation.

I say that, so far from blame attaching to the magistrates in reference to this matter, the blame attaches to this House, by reason of the extreme views held on the one side by the extreme temperance party, no doubt from the highest motives, and on the other side by these who have contended that the State has allowed a trade to be built up which ought not to be disturbed without compensation, and that the compensation ought to come out of public money. Because of those extreme views, we have been cowards in not grappling with the question and trying to find a way out of the difficulty for the magistrates.

Now what is the present condition of affairs? I do really ask the attention of the House to what I believe to be an intolerable condition of affairs. I have had the honour of having sent to me a speech made by Mr. Arthur Chamberlain at Birmingham. I have not the pleasure of knowing him, but I should say from the speech—his action generally is dictated, I have not the least doubt, by the very highest motives—I should say he has a good deal of the grit of the clan. But what is the complaint Mr. Arthur Chamberlain makes? Birmingham has been active on the question of licensing reform. The magistrates have, I think wrongly, though no doubt conscientiously, been putting in force powers which have for a very long time lain dormant. What has been the result? I ask hon. Members to consider this because in taking Birmingham you take the instance of a place in which the law has been put in force more boldly and more strongly by the magistrates than probably in any other district in the country. What has happened? Why, Sir, the very moment the magistrates began to reduce these houses in any considerable numbers the whole licensing committee were turned off and Mr. Arthur Chamberlain was deposed. What is his own statement in the speech which I have referred to—that, although everybody agrees in Birmingham that there is an excess of public-houses, at the last brewster sessions not one single house has been interfered with, and the question has been allowed to lapse into the state in which it was before the magistrates began to take action. What does that show? It shows that you have a system which is spasmodic—a system which is administered not merely by what we know is generally the exercise of no discretion at all, but a system which is open to the influences of agitation on the one side or the other, and in which the magistrates are unable to pursue the ordinary even tenor of the course of justice because they have not the power of preventing the injustice which is necessarily incurred unless you admit this question of compensation in relation to the extinction of public-houses. How can it be otherwise? The hon. and learned Member for Blackpool gave some experiences of his own as to how some licensed houses were suppressed and others allowed to survive. Why, Sir, the whole question of the administration of justice in reference to the licensing of public-houses is carried on on the principle of a toss-up. And why? Because if you find three houses in a place, any one of which you know has to be suppressed, on what possible principle can you suppress it unless you put the three names into a hat, and tell the man who is drawn out that he has to go away perfectly happy, because this is the proper way to administer justice, and that although he is a ruined man he had an equal chance with the other two of being allowed to survive. Believe me that no law in its administration can be carried on under such circumstances as these, and the very gravest difficulty which those who object to any change in the present system incur, to use a paradox, is the success that they themselves have obtained; because the more it is brought home to the people by administration that the law is in such confusion as I have depicted—the more it is brought home to them that injustice is done—there is, and always must be, such agitation existing against the magistrates, or whoever may be the administering power, that it becomes absolutely impossible to go on and support the plan on which they have acted for the purpose of extinguishing excessive licences.

What further happened as regards licensing last year? The moment the magistrates in the various districts—there were only a few—proceeded to take away a number of these licensed houses a Bill was introduced into this House by my hon. and learned friend the Member for York. How was that Bill received?

It was passed by an enormous majority—two to one—not confined to any particular side of the House, but drawing its numbers from all sides of the House. In the face of a Bill of that kind passing in that way, how can you expect that people will acquiesce in the action of the magistrates? The House of Commons declared by an enormous majority that these licences ought not to be taken away without payment of compensation. Well, surely, if that be so, we ought not to be told by the right hon. Gentleman who last addressed the House, that the Bill is nothing but a means of interfering with the discretion of the magistrates. Sir, it is exactly the very opposite. The truth in regard to this Bill is that it finds a just and equitable way for the magistrates; and in a few moments when I come to criticise the provisions of the Bill, I think I shall be able to show that every alteration that the Bill proposes in the law is made solely with the view of properly setting up some tribunal for the administration of the compensation fund under the Bill. One matter I noticed in the speech of the Leader of the Opposition. That right hon. Gentleman told us a great deal about the compensation provided in the Bill; but he did not tell us whether he was in favour of compensation himself.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The hon. and learned Member for Blackpool told us that.

Sir EDWARD CARSON: I say that that is rather a trivial kind of way of treating a serious matter; for, after all, the right hon. Gentleman is necessarily a great authority in the country in relation to this Bill and these debates; and it is not an unfair question to ask whether he is in favour of compensation or whether he is not? That is a vital question, and for this reason. We are, and, as was stated by the hon. Member for Rye, the whole House is, in favour of compensation, and, therefore, what right have we to ask or encourage the magistrates to take away these licences until we have settled that question? Although the right hon. Gentleman has not informed us of his personal opinion on that important point, he said a great deal against the particular compensation scheme in this Bill. It is often, perhaps, a wise way to knock down a proposal by criticism, even if you have nothing to set up in its place; but I will show that the right hon. Gentleman's criticism of our scheme is entirely unfounded.

What is his objection to that scheme of compensation? Assume for a moment that you are to have compensation—and I think that he has not denied that—let us see how it ought to be provided. The controversy between the two sides of the House, up to the present moment, has been aggravated by the fact that, on the one side extremists are opposed to compensation or say that the brewers should pay it, and that on the other side it is said that the brewers and others thought that the compensation should be paid out of the public funds. But the right hon. Gentleman asks what is the principle of our Bill? I will tell him that the principle is a compromise between the two extremes. That principle lies in the second main clause of the Bill. First, that you are to have compensation. That is a concession on the one side; the concession on the other side is that the public are not to pay a penny, but that the brewers and the publicans are to find the compensation themselves. What is the objection to the compensation under the Bill which is to be found by the trade? "Oh," says the right hon. Gentleman, "although it is to be found by the trade, it is really public money." That is a startling proposition. That leads a man really to meditate and to argue, "Is any man in the possession of any money at all?" When does the money earned by him in his trade cease to be public money? How much must be given to the State before he has a right to say that any of it is his own? Nobody is more attacked in this House on their salaries than the law officers of the Crown. Yes, but when I am considering the salary I get from the public, can I consider any part of it my own? [An Hon. Member: When you get it.] Every part of it is liable to taxation, as I well know, because it is not only taxed, but the amount of the tax is kept back before the salary is paid. If the criterion is to be that the money is money that may at some time form a proper object of taxation, then I cannot see what is the difference between my salary and the money that is earned, not yet the subject of public taxation, by the licensed trade. If that argument had not been used by the right hon. Gentleman, I would have been inclined to apply to it either a schoolboy's phrase or to say it was not worthy of the House of Commons.

What is his next objection? Our Bill provides that the ascertainment of compensation is to be by the Revenue authorities on the same principle that they ascertain the death duties. Could anything be fairer? You say to the owner of an estate consisting of a public-house or public-houses, "We value your licensed premises at so much, and therefore you must pay the duty," and we also say, "If we extinguish you for public purposes we shall value your premises at exactly the same rate." The right hon. Gentleman finds fault with that. He says that the Revenue authorities are very grasping and put very high values upon these premises. Does he see where that argument leads? The high and grasping authority for the State finds nothing in existence and puts an exorbitant valuation upon it. Then the high and grasping authority, when it puts that valuation, comes to the conclusion that it ought to make a valuation in favour of the Revenue. The truth of the matter is, we have put in this provision because we thought that nothing fairer could be devised as a measure by which the owner of the house could get compensation if his house was taken away and extinguished. "But," says the right hon. Gentleman, "you ought to have left a measure of the value to the Courts and not to have taken it away from the Courts." I do not think the right hon. Gentleman is a master of the procedure under this Bill, because if he had been he would have seen that there is an appeal from either of the parties to the High Court from the amount of value that may be assessed by the Inland Revenue Commissioners who make the valuation exactly in the same manner, as there is from the valuation for the death duties. Therefore, I say that, as far as his objection goes to our scheme, if we are to have compensation at all the whole of his argument absolutely fails.

Then the right hon. Gentleman said that nothing is being given to the publican and that everything goes to the brewer. That I deny absolutely. The Bill itself is most explicit on the subject. It says that quarter sessions are to settle the various differences between the publican and the brewer and all other persons interested in the licences. My right. hon. friend asked a question the other day as to whether we could say how much each will get. How can you say how much each will get, having regard to the varied and diverse agreements? [Ironical OPPOSITION cheers.] I recognise the cheer. It is impossible to state that. The only fair way in which that can be ascertained is to leave it to the tribunal which knows what it is doing in extinguishing licences in a district or county where the magistrates themselves live, and who, I think, will take care that ample justice is done as well to the publican as to the brewer.

The right hon. Gentleman made a number of criticisms as regards our interference with the magistrates. Sir, I said before, and I repeat, that there has been no interference with the magistrates under the Bill which is not necessitated by the fact that you have to distribute money for compensation. In the first place, as regards new licences the question is left practically as it was before. If there is a refusal of a new licence, and there never has been an appeal to any other tribunal in that case, the matter remains exactly the same under the Bill. If there is a granting of a new licence in a county you have always to get confirmation from quarter sessions, or I think the district licensing committee of the quarter sessions; and practically it is the same in the non-county boroughs. No change has been made because the justices in the borough will confirm and there will be no difference. Therefore as regards new licences nothing whatever can be said, but as regards renewal of existing licences let us see how the matter stands. The whole difficulty in framing the Bill in regard to the renewal of licences has been to find what is the proper compensation area. The Bill has no intention whatever of taking away any power from the magistrates which they already have. It would be impossible to set up each bench of licensing magistrates as a compensation authority. You must have a compensating authority so large that you will be able to raise sufficient revenue for the purpose of extinguishing public-houses, and the only interference with the present tribunal, and the sole reason for it, is that you must have one authority, and we have selected the quarter sessions for the administration of the compensation fund they are to receive. There is no initiative now, nor has there ever been any initiative, in quarter sessions, as to the refusal of renewals. That remains, exactly as it was before, with the local justices, with this alteration that they cannot themselves say that they refuse the licence and let an appeal be to quarter sessions; but they will say: "We recommend quarter sessions to refuse the licence" and quarter sessions will refuse the licence if they are satisfied that circumstances warrant it. That is the whole difference. The great mistake in the argument is to suppose that the local justices ever had unfettered power to refuse a renewal. They had no such power; every case had to go to quarter sessions. So far from wishing to take any power from the licensing justices, our idea was that quarter sessions with the report before them would be a better administrative body. Not only would the licensing justices be heard, but the committee of quarter sessions would be bound to have consultation with the licensing justices who had made the report, and to ascertain from them their views, when they came to the selection of the various houses which ought to be extinguished, and which funds allowed should be extinguished, for the purposes of determining which of the various houses in the different areas within the jurisdiction of the quarter sessions should be removed. This, at all events, is not a scheme for taking away the power of the local justices. You are really giving local justices much greater power, much more dignified power. I ask the House whether it is better that we should stay as we are, carrying on the old struggle and doing nothing, or is it better that we should apply, at the expense of the trade, £1,200,000 a year, for the purpose of extinguishing unnecessary licences. Nay more; is it better that we should leave indefinitely in existence the 35,000 licences which no magistrate can touch, or is it better that in a general scheme, and as part of a compromise between the parties, that they should come in and that magistrates should obtain the same absolute control over them that they have long since had over other licensed houses.

The whole question in this case is, ought there to be compensation, or ought there not? The moment you agree that there ought to be compensation, I say that our Bill will hold the field until you give us a better alternative. In the debate up to the present no such alternative has been given. I have looked back through the debates on this question, and the one matter upon which there has been a unanimity, an almost absolute unanimity, on the part of all responsible Ministers on both sides of the House, through the long series of years which commenced in 1871, has been that you cannot destroy an existing trade such as the licensed trade without paying compensation. Mr. Bruce's Bill, which was brought in by a Liberal Government, and which was perhaps the most advanced Bill which was ever attempted to be passed though this House, laid down in the most absolute terms that no Party and no Government could dare to face the extinction of any property or any trade without giving compensation, and at that time compensation meant compensation out of public money. In 1880, coming down a decade, the hon. Baronet who has been such an honourable champion of the cause to which he has devoted a great portion of his life, had a very curious experience in this House. His Motion for local option was at one time defeated, and shortly afterwards a general election occurred and then it was carried by a large majority. I have looked through the debates on those Motions, and I have found that every Leader of the Liberal Party and of this Party—one and all said that they could not deal with the question without admitting the principle of compensation. One of the most remarkable speeches in those debates was made by the late Mr. Gladstone, whose speeches are so often appealed to in this House. Although Mr. Gladstone was in complete sympathy with the views of the hon. Baronet, because his Motion did not embody a grant for compensation for the extinction of licences he absolutely refused to vote with the hon. Baronet. He said on that occasion—

> "We ought not to allow our prejudices with regard to this particular trade, or our sense of the enormous mischiefs associated with its working, to cause us to deviate by one hair's breadth from the principle on which Parliament has always acted in analogous circumstances—namely, that where a vested interest has been allowed to grow up the question of compensation should be considered when such vested interests were proposed to be interfered with by Act of Parliament. What I am prepared to say is neither more nor less than this, that the licensed victualler has the same right to fair consideration that is enjoyed by persons following every other trade or calling which is interfered with by Act of Parliament, and to whom compensation is awarded owing to such interference. We must not allow—I need not say that Gentlemen on this side of the House will not allow—any political feeling or prejudice to interfere with the rectitude of our judgment, or to prevent us from giving the same measure of justice or indulgence to licensed victuallers that we should give to any other class in the community. If that be so, I am inclined to think that this Resolution, which is to be regarded as a sort of charter laying down the lines of our future conduct, ought to contain at least an allusion to the question of compensation. When Parliament enacted negro emancipation it was preceded by a preliminary Resolution in which the principle of compensation was recognised. My hon. friend says we must wait till a claim for compensation is made. Parliament does not act on that principle. Where the facts presented the possibility of such a claim the recognition of the policy has, I think, taken place in the original proceedings of Parliament. In the face of these difficulties I am not able to support the Resolution of my hon. friend, while I certainly shall not place myself in the position of appearing to give a constructive sanction to the present law."

SIR WILFRID LAWSON (Cornwall, Camborne): He voted for me afterwards.

SIR EDWARD CARSON: But not in the division.

SIR WILFRID LAWSON: Oh, no! I meant in a later year.

SIR EDWARD CARSON: I have no means of knowing how the change was brought about. I take the fact as I find it there. What has happened since? I shall only read one other quotation to the House, and I apologise for so doing, but this is the whole matter and root of the controversy. In 1890 Lord Randolph Churchill, who everybody knows was as keen a reformer of the licensing law as ever sat in this House, made a speech which, as many of his speeches have done, won not only the admiration of those present but of those who have read them since, and having shown his entire acquaintance with the whole question and having won the applause of both sides of the House, he then said—

> "But I hold that compensation for vested interests is an indispensable accompaniment to any scheme of licensing reform. Any such reform not accompanied by compensation for vested interests would be sheer confiscation and robbery."

and later on he said—

> "It has been admitted on both sides of the House that the custom of renewing licences has become so prevalent and so strong that the licences so issued have become property, and I think that in the discussion of this question the arguments in favour of compensation for vested interests have predominated."

Well, Sir, if those have been the opinions of those great authorities—I use them not as trying to influence the House—but if through a long series of years, from 1871, every responsible Minister on both sides of the House has put forward this same idea as regards compensation, was it not natural that the licensed trade, who were investing their money, should look to what was being said in this House as to what were their rights, and how those rights were likely to be dealt with if ever they were to be interfered with by this House?

SIR ROBERT REID (Dumfries Burghs): There was the Bill of 1895.

SIR EDWARD CARSON: That was not a serious Bill. That was a Bill introduced by the right hon. Gentleman when he was Chancellor of the Exchequer. He did admit some claim for compensation with a time limit of a very diminutive character, but I well recollect Sir Edward Clarke stating that it was not a serious Bill and it would never be put down for Second Reading, and it never was. The Government came to an end, but more than that happened — the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby was turned out, largely, I expect, by the influence of the licensed trade in that district. Then we come in and we have a Commission appointed. The Commission make two Reports—a Majority Report which everybody, curiously enough, I suppose because it is a Majority Report, seems to neglect—and also a Minority Report. But both Reports were unanimous in recommending compensation. It is true they did not approach the question in exactly the same way—one was in favour of money compensation, and the other was in favour, if I recollect aright, of some time limit compensation.

The question of time limit is one that is likely to give rise to a good deal of confusion, for the simple reason that nearly everybody uses the phrase "time limit" in an absolutely different sense. There are two alternatives. You can give the alternative of a number of years in which the trade will not be disturbed and tell them, "That is your compensation," or you can tell them, "If you are disturbed we will give you money." I do not suppose the trade would care very much which they got if you made the term of years long enough, because in both cases it is a question of insurance, and therefore it would come to the same thing. Let those who think there ought to be a time limit ask themselves if they mean a time limit accompanied by a compulsory insurance which is to have no effect when the time expires. That is as if I was asked to enter into an engagement to make an insurance upon my own life in which the only good fortune that could happen to me would be that I should die within a specified period limited by the insurance. The truth of the matter is that this question of a time limit is a question for Committee, because until we know what it is and the particular Member proposes it, it is impossible to discuss it. What is the number of years you propose?—that must be at the very root if it. Do you propose it concurrently with the compensation scheme under the Bill? If you do, you are at once met by this, that if you make it a short period of years then the money available for the purchase of the excess of licensed houses will at once decrease and the borrowing power will at once become impossible, because you cannot give up your insurance after you have gone beyond the time limit. On the other hand, if you mean it as an alternative you revolutionise the Bill. All I say to those who think there ought to be a time limit, and have some definite proposal in their minds, is that when we come to Committee by all means, if it is necessary, let us discuss it and see whether a time limit can be framed which will not in the least degree militate against the scheme of this Bill which is an insurance scheme for the licensed publican, and let us not talk wildly on the subject until we have the absolute scheme itself before us.

I have trespassed a long time on the patience of the House, and I shall only say in conclusion that I believe we have now come to an arrangement which would have been impossible at any other time. I believe hon. Gentlemen opposite will accept the principle of compensation if on the other hand the trade will accept the principle that the compensation is to be paid by themselves. If that is so I believe we have established a principle of licensing reform which may be invaluable for its future development. But if we neglect the present opportunity and adopt the *non possumus* attitude adopted by those on the other side of the House at the present time, then, Sir, the old bitter dispute will go on with the same result that has happened for the last thirty years. You will subordinate the interest of temperance to the interest of politics, and at the end of a long number of years you will be no better off than you are now.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs) complimented the hon. and learned Gentleman on the able manner in which he had defended a very bad Bill. One or two of the points made had an interest quite beyond the mere discussion of the Bill, particularly in the last few words uttered with regard to the time limit. He was very glad to find that the attitude the hon. and learned Gentleman had adopted in that regard was very different to that adopted by the right hon. Gentleman the Colonial Secretary, and if he might say so was a very much more statesmanlike attitude. The hon. and learned Gentleman did not close his mind to the consideration of possible schemes for a time limit. He had suggested a few considerations, some of which it was of the greatest importance to take into account before the Committee stage. The hon. and learned Member suggested time limit with insurance, time limit without insurance, and insurance without time limit. Those were three things which the House must take into consideration before the Committee stage arrived. It was with the greatest delight that he found the Government had not closed their minds upon that. With regard to the time limit, he would only say it was assumed that the question was entirely a question of whether they were going to close a number of public-houses without giving equitable consideration to the persons whose houses were to be closed through no fault of their own. He did not believe that was the question. The hon. Member for the Spen Valley Division had made it perfectly clear, so far as he was concerned, that he was prepared to consider any scheme of that kind which would meet with hard cases such as had been suggested during the discussion. Let it not, therefore, be treated as if it was a mere matter of compensation on one side and no sympathetic treatment on the other. In reference to the time limit the right hon.Gentleman the Colonial Secretary put the case of a man paying his insurance on a time limit of twenty years, and who, at the end of twenty years, when his licence came to a termination, did not get a penny from his insurance. True, but it was better for him to live that twenty years than that somebody else should have received his insurance at the end of ten years. During the ten years his earnings would probably be considerably more than the highest insurance he would ever contemplate. The same would apply to the publican. He would take a case with a rental of £250 a year. On that the publican would pay possibly £30 per annum; which in twenty years would amount to £600. But his profits would be at least double his rent, or £500 a year; so that at the end of twenty years he would have made £10,000, and paid only £600. If asked which he would prefer, the £600 insurance or the £10,000 profit, there was not the slightest doubt that he would rather go on paying the insurance throughout the period.

Then the power of dividing the compensation was given to the quarter sessions. If that power were absolute, or if any principle were laid down it would be exceedingly valuable. Personally, he would go very far in the direction of giving them a discretion in the distribution of the fund. The right hon. Gentleman had been asked how the fund was to be divided between the publican and the owner of the premises, and that was a very important question. The man who suffered the real hardship was the man deprived of his living. After having spent the whole of his life in a single trade he was turned adrift, and if a general reduction ol licences was proceeding over the country it must be very difficult to find employment of a similar character. In such a case there was a certain hardship which ought to be met. Whether it should be met by a time limit or by pecuniary compensation was another matter. This question of compensation was really a more serious blot on the Bill than he had imagined possible. The right hon. Gentleman had stated that the division of the money would depend on the agreements. About nine-tenths of the public-houses in the country were practically tied houses, in which the men earning their living as publicans were subject to three, six, or twelve months and in some cases even to a week's notice. If those agreements were taken into account, and the division made on legal principles of assessment, the publican would be turned adrift with three months salary in his pocket, while the whole of the compensation went to the speculators in the licence. What was the good of talking about principles of justice and equity, and then introducing a Bill under which all the benefit went to the gambler in licences and none to the man who was deprived of his living.

The right hon. Gentleman had entered upon a review of the various attempts which had been made to settle the temperance question. It was a dismal record! No end of Resolutions had been carried and Bills referred to Committees upstairs or passed through their Second Reading, and then had come to naught. But what had that fact to do with this Bill? If this were a real effort to settle the question he could understand an appeal being based on the failures of the past. Instead of that, it was a Bill to add to existing difficulties. No matter what scheme had been suggested—whether municipalisation, companies, new trusts, reduction of licences, high licence duty, Gothenburg system—the present Bill set up a barrier against it. Everybody admitted that a reduction of licences was desirable, that as to drinking habits we compared badly with any other civilised nation in the world, and that great evils were produced by intemperance; and yet the Prime Minister, surveying the situation with the eye of statesmanship, declared that nothing could be done, and that the only reform possible was a further protection of the drink traffic.

Upon what ground was a freehold valuation to be granted for these licences? If the drink trade came to the House of Commons, admitting they had no legal claim, but asking that equitable consideration should be given to men who had been earning their living under legal sanction, and were now to be deprived of that living, he did not believe any Party in the House would refuse to consider the matter in that light. But if they came declaring they had a legal right, and demanding legal compensation, the country was entitled to treat them on a perfectly legal basis and see how they came out. Every speaker acquainted with the law had admitted that the publican had only an annual licence. It was true he had a legal expectation of renewal, and his chances would probably be 200 or 300 to one, but what the opponents of this Bill complained of was that that expectation was converted into a right. The assessment of the Inland Revenue officials had been quoted as a proof that a licence was a legal property. What other legal property was there with the same attributes—a property of which the holder could be deprived for misconduct or because his neighbours did not wish him to possess it? It was really not a property at all; the highest at which it could be put was that of a reasonable expectation. What the Estates Commissioners said was: "You have a licence for a year, but we admit you have a reasonable expectation that it will be renewed provided you are not guilty of misconduct and it is not proved to be unnecessary." Upon that expectation gamblers speculated. It was a reasonable speculation, but it was a speculation on chances. There were elements of uncertainty in it, and what the Inland Revenue authorities said was: "If those chances are good enough to speculate upon they are good enough to pay duty upon." If this Bill introduced any new element of uncertainty there might be a claim for compensation, but instead of that it added an element of certainty to the granting of the licence by putting difficulties in the way of refusing, by depriving magistrates of the power of withdrawing absolutely, and by depriving the public of the right of appearing before the Court which decided the matter. That being so, what claim was there for compensation? These were annual licences, renewable on consideration at an annual gathering of magistrates. What distinction was there between that and an annual tenancy? Hundreds of thousands of tenants in the country could say that they occupied property on an annual lease which from time immemorial had been renewed Were the Government prepared to carry this principle to the extent of saying that no man should be evicted from an annual tenancy unless he received freehold valuation for his property?

The Irish Land Act might be taken as an illustration. In Ireland there was an annual tenancy which had been renewed for generations, but when Mr. Gladstone proposed to convert that tenancy into a reasonable certainty, hon. Members opposite cried "Confiscation!" Confiscation of whose right? Of the right of the man who granted the annual lease to the tenant! There were similarities and a difference between the two cases. Both were annual; both might have been renewed from time immemorial; both had reasonable expectations of renewal which could be actuarialy calculated. In one case that expectation was converted into a certainty, and there was this difference. In Ireland it was only a great public necessity, that the country was in a state of revolution, that the country was devastated, that there was poverty, misery, and distress, and scores of thousands of the best subjects in Ireland being driven away to America. Therefore nothing would justify that course except the most urgent public necessity which was in the interest of Ireland, and Mr. Gladstone never put it on any other ground. It was a measure of urgency and an exceptional Bill to meet exceptional circumstances. Now the Government said there was a great necessity for converting the publican's annual licence into a freehold. Did anyone contend that it was being done in the interests of the country? Could anyone point out any desolation or distress caused by the 300 evictions of licensed holders, or to any devastation of the country side, as was the case in Ireland, where whole villages were converted into a wilderness, as anyone who had been to Ireland must have seen. In Ireland at that time scores of thousands of healthy, strong peasants crossed the Atlantic, but simply 300 out of 100,000 licences were now deemed sufficient in the interests of the publicans to bring forward these proposals. And yet the Party who denounced the first transaction in the interests of Ireland were now prepared to do the very same thing in this case when it was in the interests of a corporation.

He would put the case from another point of view; they were told to remember the interests of the publican and to remember the interests of the capitalist who had sunk money in public-houses. Was there anyone else who had got any interest in the matter? The freehold now was vested in the public. What was known in law as the reversionary interest was now vested in the public. Were they only going to consider a freehold when it was vested in landlords, and disregard it when it was vested in the public? The magistrates had no right to consider the interest of the 100,000 tenants. They should give them fair conditions, and no more, but it was in the interests of the public that they renewed the licences out of the freehold vested in the public. What was the proposal now? The public interest in the reversion was a financial one; it was represented, if they liked, in cash. Hon. Members had, if he might say so, declined to consider any interest which they could not materialise into capital. They could materialise the reversionary interest of the public, even in cash. What was it? The rates, as the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, which were the result of the administration of the licensing laws, would be higher, and that was the cash interest. What was more, if they had got an excess of licences, they depreciated the value of property throughout the whole district. That was the financial interest of the people in licensing. Anyone who had watched the thing knew how, if there was an excess of drinking in a neighbourhood, the industry in that neighbourhood was affected. Take any great industrial town like Sheffield or Manchester, or anywhere else: they might take, if they liked, the towns of South Wales in the same way. On Monday mornings they found hundreds of thousands of workmen not in a fit condition to carry on their trade. One result of this was that industry was dislocated. The excess of drinking did produce a dislocation of industry, and what did that mean? It meant that they reduced the prosperity of the town, that they crippled its industry, and everybody suffered because of the man whose profit was largely dependent upon the excess in drinking. What did this Bill do? It said that the pecuniary interest of the men or the corporations who were making the profit out of that very evil which brought trade to a standstill and dislocated industry should be protected and that they would recognise and materialise his interest; but with regard to the financial interest of the vast mass of the public who had an honest interest in the property depreciated the Government said, "We will confiscate that, and this freehold we will transfer to somebody else who is making a profit out of it." What was the use of talking about confiscation? This Bill was the grossest confiscation ever introduced into this House, and it was not justified upon any principle of public interest at all.

The Government talked as if this was the first time a Bill had ever been produced for curtailing licences. Anybody who had read the history of the Licensing Laws knew that a series of laws had been brought in from the days of Henry VII. for the purpose of suppressing licences. He would give a quotation from one Act, namely, the 5th and 6th Edward VI., which was as follows:—

> "For as much as intolerable hurts and troubles to the commonwealth of this realm do

grow and increase in common ale-houses, and other houses called tippling-houses, it is, therefore, enacted that the justices of the peace can in every shire, city, borough, or town, within the realm, two of them at least, shall have full power to remove, discharge, or put away the common selling of ale and beer in any ale-houses or tippling-houses in such towns."

In those days full power was granted to the magistrates to do away with those houses whenever they liked, and there was no power of compensation. Take the Act of George II., when the same thing was done with regard to distilleries, which were suppressed absolutely, without a suggestion of compensation. Then there was the Act of George III., when heaps of licences were suppressed, especially in the City of London, because they were a common danger and created drunkenness. Nobody ever thought of suggesting that there should be compensation to anybody, for it was considered that they were a danger to the public peace, and ought to be suppressed, and that was considered to be quite enough.

What was the present position? Here was a great monopoly and a very valuable one. What was the meaning of a monopoly? They did not want to licence butchers' houses, or grocers', or drapery businesses, and why did they licence the trade? The suggestion was that a publican might break the law. The meaning was that here was a commodity which the public demanded, which was a public necessity, or at least, that was the assumption of the law. But it was also a great public danger; if people got drink in excess it was a danger to the public, to the public health, and to the public welfare. They could not possibly by means of police regulations prevent publicans selling more drink than was good for the public. Therefore, they had to take the best means of examining their character, and they must have men they could trust, who would not take an unfair advantage of the monopoly. That was really what all this licensing monopoly meant. They could not trust everybody. How had the trade conducted that trust? Had they kept faith with the public? In this country they drank twice as much per head as the people of the United States of America, and there was a considerable excess of drinking even in America. In this country there were 160,000 convictions for drunkenness every year, and these were all so many breaches of faith with the public, and everyone of them represented a breach of the trust upon which the monopoly was granted. The way in which they produced poverty, crime, and misery, showed that somebody or other had broken faith with the public. If the trade had exercised discipline within its own borders, there might have been a case made out for this Bill. This trade was not the only monopoly, for they had the solicitors' monopoly, though not to the same extent, for solicitors would not get thirteen years purchase. Take the case of the medical profession, which, to a certain extent, constituted a monopoly. They got some sort of recognition from the State. Take both the legal and the medical professions. They recognised that they had a monopoly and that they must keep faith with the public who granted it. What was the result? They established bodies for their defence like the Incorporated Law Society and the General Medical Council in order to maintain discipline. Those two bodies exercised disciplinary powers over their respective professions, and they dealt not merely with offences against the law, but exercised a discipline where something was done which they regarded as contrary to the honour of the profession to which they belonged, and which tended to dishonour and degrade it and make the public lose confidence in it. He did not mean to say that that discipline was as effective as it ought to be, but at any rate they were bodies which initiated discipline in their own ranks. Had the trade done that? On the contrary, when there was a prosecution for a breach of the law the Society of Licensed Victuallers placed the whole of the resources of their trade at the disposal of the man who had broken the law and he never heard of the Licensed Victuallers Association acknowledging that they owed a great duty to the public who had given them this monopoly. It should be a point of honour with them to keep faith with the public who had allowed them this monopoly. All these breaches of the law represented increased profits, increased value and increased compensation. The trade had no right to come to the public and claim compensation until they had first kept faith with the public.

It was said that a practice had grown up, but the practice had not gone beyond this—that as long as a publican conducted himself properly and as long as the neighbourhood wanted the publichouse the licence would be renewed. The advocates of temperance had never claimed anything more. He regretted that the Government had not taken this opportunity of really attempting a settlement of this question. He remembered an article in the *Spectator* two or three years ago—before that journal had quarrelled with the Government on other issues—in which it congratulated the Government on having escaped the swing of the pendulum, warned them that they would not escape again, and counselled them to act as if they were going to die and bring in honest Bills. Two of the measures recommended were University education for Ireland and redistribution of seats. A third was, or ought certainly to have been, this temperance question, which was a difficult one for any Party to take up, although it urgently demanded attention in the real interest of this country. Now let him make an appeal to the Prime Minister, if he might do so. Why did not the right hon. Gentleman take this question up and try to effect a real settlement? Let him take the *Spectator's* advice, especially as it did not very much matter what he did now. His chance would not come again until after the next general election. Here was a question of enormous importance, and he had a perfectly unique opportunity of settling it. There were extreme men on both sides of the House. He said the same thing in regard to the education question. He had always felt in regard to the education question that if they could close their doors, turn out the reporters, and vote by ballot they would be able to solve their difficulties by the morning. Similarly with the temperance question. He was certain there were men on the Benches opposite who were sincerely desirous of settling this question and who were as fully convinced of the dangers of the drink traffic as any teetotaler. He was convinced the Prime Minister could bring in a Bill which, while it might perhaps excite animosity on the part of the brewery interests, and he dared say on the part of his hon. friend the Member for Cornwall, would really help to settle the question. But the right hon. Gentleman had introduced a Bill, which made settlement impossible—a pusillanimous Bill, which left a terrific problem for somebody in the future to settle. If the Prime Minister had come down and said that this was a question which must be settled, and that he was going to face unpopular compensation, if he had said that it would cost so much to the country one would have felt symyathy with him, and admired the daring of the scheme, but at the same time one would have felt that he was making a real effort to settle the question. But this Bill was simply putting off the evil day and making that evil day worse when it arrived. If the right hon. Gentleman were to follow the example of a great predecessor in his own Party—Sir Robert Peel—and, not considering the selfish interests of men on his own side, not considering even extreme appeals from the other side, but simply considering that there was a great evil from which his country was suffering, and that the opportunity had arrived for settling it, and boldly faced the problem and insisted on settling it, he would have added lustre to the great renown he had already attained.

*MR. BUTCHER (York) said the hon. Member had vaguely indicated, but had not explained, some possible solution of this question which would enable the lion and the lamb to lie down together. How lamentable it was that the hon. Member had not taken advantage of the golden opportunity and sketched out this ideal settlement of a difficult problem. He had not even been able to discover from the hon. Member's remarks what his real views were on the main question involved in the Bill, that of compensation. He was not quite sure that the hon. Member knew himself. Although at the beginning of his speech the hon. Member said he was prepared to give a man who was dispossessed of his licence "sympathetic treatment," the greater part of his speech attempted to prove that the owner of the licence belonged to the criminal class.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: There are some things I do not mind when they are said by hon. Gentlemen opposite, but I really must protest against the statement, for somebody might believe it somewhere, that I tried to prove that the owner of a licence was a member of the criminal class. I never said anything so preposterous and stupid.

*Mr. **BUTCHER** said he was delighted to hear that the hon. Gentleman repudiated that interpretation of his speech, but he must say that that was the impression he had derived from the way in which the hon. Member had spoken of the holders of these licences. But if the hon. Member was vague in his views as to compensation there was nothing vague in the views he expressed as to the demerits of this Bill, which he had described, in language of extravagant exaggeration, as one of the greatest acts of confiscation he had ever known. It was hardly necessary to comment on that language. He wished to examine the question not in the interest of any class or trade, but in the interest of the community at large whom he recognised as deeply interested in the regulation of the liquor trade. He supposed that every man in this House must deeply and earnestly desire to rid the country of the curse of drunkenness. For his own part he sometimes doubted whether by legislation alone they were likely to effect any great diminution in drunkenness. He looked forward to effect that result by the better education of the people, better conditions of housing, and reasonable means of recreation; but he thought that in the meantime they were bound to do the best they could by legislation to diminish this great evil. Some of the proposals that had been made, he confessed, were framed in disregard of the real facts of the situation. What were these facts? The first was that for a very great number of years the State had granted a licence or authority to individuals to carry on the sale of drink. It was true that the State had imposed certain stringent conditions, and it was right that if a person broke those conditions he should bear the penalty. But when a man in that trade observed all the conditions which the State imposed upon him, he was entitled to as fair and reasonable treatment as if he were engaged in selling tea, ginger beer, or any other commodity. That was not such a commonplace as it might seem, because some of the speeches which were heard, and some of the expressions and resolutions he had received would lead one to imagine that a man engaged in the trade of drink-selling was a malefactor. In fact, many of the proposals made in the alleged interests of temperance were made, not so much to promote temperance as to injure the publicans. He maintained that they were no more entitled to treat a man who sold drink as a malefactor, than the man who consumed drink in a perfectly moderate manner as a criminal.

The second consideration was this, that while the licence under which a person had been selling drink was in a strictly legal sense renewable only year by year, by a long course of custom it had been renewed almost as a matter of course in the absence of misconduct. The effect of that long usage and custom had been to give the licence a definite value as property. Now, that value had been recognised, not only by the individuals themselves, but over and over again by the State. That property value had been rated, it had paid rates; it had been valued for death duties, and had paid death duties. He had in his hands a paper issued by the Inland Revenue in 1890, showing that when a man who had any interest either as an owner, leaseholder, or mortgagee in licensed premises died, the State exacted duties on the basis that the licence would be continuously renewed, and that the licence had a corresponding value. It was inconceivable for him to understand how it could be gravely urged that property which was rated and which paid death duties to the State was not property at all. He believed the State would never be a party to so gross an injustice as was involved in that assertion. It was desirable to get out of their heads some of the cant sometimes heard about wealthy brewers. If it was not fair to take away a licence from a poor man, it could not be right to take it away from a rich man. In the course of years thousands of small investors had invested their savings in licensed property on the footing that the licence would be renewed, and in that they had only followed the lead of the State itself. Were these men to be told that because they had followed the lead of the State they were to be deprived of their property, because the State had changed its mind? So far, the facts were open and notorious. The State granted this licence, and the licence was regarded as having a definite property value.

But now came the crux of the whole situation. They had on the one hand the fact that there was a general consensus of opinion that there ought to be a large reduction in the number of licensed premises. On the other hand, there was a strong public opinion that it was a gross injustice to deprive a man of what had been recognised as property without compensating him, if he had committed no wrong. It was said, and perfectly truly, that as matters stood, a very small reduction of licences was practically possible. The main reason for that was, that the licensing magistrates acted as fair minded and reasonable men. When they were asked to suppress an unnecessary licence they were put in a most difficult position; if they refused a renewal of the licence to a holder, who had done no wrong, they did an injustice to that man, and if they granted a renewal of the licence, they did an injustice to the public. The conclusion to which they were led was to his mind inevitable, that if they wanted to carry out a great public object, which all agreed was desirable, they must introduce some system of compensation to the men who were wiped out. There they were brought face to face with the first principle of the Bill, namely, that of compensation, as to which the House had expressed its opinion last year. To his mind, when they had settled that there was to be compensation, and that that compensation was to come out of the trade, they had settled the two principles on which the Bill was founded, and the rest was mainly machinery for the purpose of carrying out those principles.

Many of the objections to the Bill were founded on ignorance; others, he was afraid, had a less reputable foundation. He had in his hand a pamphlet sent to him by Mr. Arthur Chamberlain, which exhibited the high-water mark of unreasonableness that had been reached by the opponents of the Bill. In that pamphlet Mr. Arthur Chamberlain said that the compensation fund would be wholly insufficient, and he made the assertion that under the Bill it would take 180 years to reduce the licences to a reasonable number. How did he attempt to prove that astounding assertion? He made two entirely inaccurate statements. The first was, that the compensation fund for Birmingham would be £14,000. Unfortunately, it would be exactly double, or more; it would amount to £29,000. The other assertion was, that there would not be more than seven licences reduced in Birmingham in each year under the Bill taking £2,000 as the average estimated value of a licence. He should say that £500 was nearer the mark, and on that basis, instead of seven licences being reduced in each year in Birmingham, there would be something like sixty. If these statements of Mr. Arthur Chamberlain were so inaccurate as regarded Birmingham, which he was supposed to know well, the House might judge how far his statements would be accurate in regard to other parts of the country of which he was ignorant. On page nineteen of the pamphlet, Mr. Arthur Chamberlain said that Clause 9, though very short, and apparently very simple, appeared to him to be as dangerous as any clause in the Bill. Now, what was Clause 9? It ran—

> "This Act may be cited as the Licensing Act, 1904, and may be cited, and shall be construed, as one with the Licensing Act, 1828 to 1902. The Act shall not extend to Scotland or Ireland."

Mr. Arthur Chamberlain objected to this clause on the ground that it gave an appeal from the committee of the quarter sessions to the quarter sessions itself. Mr. Arthur Chamberlain might be relieved of his apprehensions, because he was as erroneous in his interpretation of the law as he was in his statement of facts. There would be no such appeal.

With reference to the statement of the hon. Member for Carvarvon Boroughs that the effect of this Bill would be to convert licences into freeholds, be maintained that the Bill would not turn licences into freeholds, but that it recognised that licences had a definite property value, and, if a licence were taken away through no fault of the person holding it, that he should be provided with compensation on the same scale as the State adopted in assessing death duties. They were told that the Bill would destroy the power of the local justices with regard to renewal, but as far as county boroughs were concerned that was an entire and complete misconception, because the powers of the local justices as to refusing the renewal of unnecessary licences were very largely increased. As regarded the change which was proposed with reference to brewster sessions in the counties it was a change more of machinery than of substance. At present, when a licence was taken away on grounds other than the misconduct of the holder, there was inevitably an appeal to quarter sessions; but under the Bill, instead of having one hearing at the brewster sessions and another at quarter sessions, there would only be one hearing before quarter sessions; but the local justices would still retain their power of initiative, and it would be more easy for them to make their wishes known to quarter sessions, and to make quarter sessions act on them under the Bill, than it was at present. At present there could only be a very small reduction in the number of licensed houses; but under the Bill a very much greater reduction would be effected which he believed would meet the legitimate desires of the most sincere and convinced temperance reformers. He supported the Bill because he believed it to be in the interests of temperance, because it brought under the jurisdiction of the magistrates the ante-1869 beerhouses, a class of licensed property which they had long desired to deal with, and enabled the justices, without injustice to any class, to effect a far greater reduction in the number of unnecessary licensed premises than was possible under the present system. He believed that this Bill was a fair solution of this difficult question, which the House of Commons had long and vainly attempted to find—a solution which would at once be fair to the licensed trade and at the same time conduce to the interests of sobriety and to the general advantage of the community.

*Mr. ASHTON (Bedfordshire, Luton) said the hon. Gentleman stated that he would support the Bill because he thought it was a measure which would promote temperance. He himself would oppose it because he believed it would accomplish very little in the direction of temperance. There was no power in the Bill for the compulsory reduction of licences at all; and it made an enormous present to the public-house owner without giving any corresponding advantage to the public. It would take away property which was recognised as belonging to the public, without giving the public anything in return. He was prepared to say that something might be done in fairness and equity for the publican in the way of a compassionate allowance—some might call it compensation — if his licence were taken away because it was unnecessary; but he was not prepared to convert a licence into a freehold. That would not be an act of fairness or of justice. He should vote against the Bill in the first place because it did not contain a time limit. He was glad to observe from speeches of hon. Members opposite that a certain number of them were in favour of a time limit; and he was also glad to notice that the Solicitor-General did not entirely bar out the possibility of a time limit being introduced. He quite understood the objection which was taken to a time limit, namely, that at the end of it Parliament would be faced with the very same difficulty that now existed. But if compensation were given until the time limit expired, and if that compensation were given on a gradually reducing scale, a great deal would be done to bring down licences to their proper value at the end of the time limit. A further safeguard might be introduced under the Bill. Provision was to be made for dealing with new licences, and he would suggest that a clause should be introduced into the Bill practically to the same effect as any clause which dealt with new licences, and that when the time limit expired, the monopoly value of the licences should be used in the same way as it was proposed to use the monopoly value of new licences.

He hoped the Home Secretary would explain the meaning of Clause 2, which provided compensation for licences which were taken away. The first subsection of that clause said that where a quarter sessions refused to renew a licence a sum equal to the difference between the value of the licensed premises, calculated as if the Act had not been passed, and the value which the premises would bear if not licensed, should be paid as compensation to the persons interested in the premises. He sought to obtain information by way of a Question from the Home Secretary as to the meaning of the words "calculated as if this Act had not been passed"; but the right hon. Gentleman said it would not be possible to give a full answer in a reply to a Question. He hoped, however, before the debate finished that an explanation would be given. As far as he understood it, the intention of the Government was a perfectly proper one. They evidently desired to limit the amount of compensation to the value of the licence at the present time. Naturally, after the Bill passed the value of licensed houses would be greater; and the Government recognised that the public had some right in the matter, and, therefore, wished to limit the amount of compensation to the present value. He did not see how that was going to be carried into effect. It was a worthy idea, but, in his opinion, impracticable. The value of these licences before the First Reading of this Bill was very different to their value after the Bill had been read a third time before passing into law. Were the licences to be taken at their value before the Bill became law or at the value they would be after? That was a matter which ought to be cleared up. His main objection, however, was the difficulty there would be in the future of assessing the value of a public-house at a past date. In valuing a public-house the valuer went to the rate-book, to the rent certificate, and to the assessment for income-tax, all of which altered and varied from year to year, and then, having made his calculations from them, he took into consideration the position of the house, and so arrived at the value of that house. But he could not say twenty years hence how much a house was worth in 1904. All the conditions would or might be altered. That was a very serious matter, though that difficulty might have been got over if the way suggested by the Majority Report of the Licencing Commission had been adopted. The suggestion made by that Report was that the owner should value the house by making a declaration of value, at which it should be assessed and at which it should be bought and sold, subject, and of course, to an appeal by the licensing committee against the value declared. In that way this difficulty might have been got rid of.

He considered the transfer of the powers of th brewster sessions to the quarter sessions to be a retrograde step. In fact they were 200 years behind the time in dealing with this matter. In 1729 a Bill was passed by the House which completely reversed the principle of this Bill. At that time the House considered the right persons to deal with this matter were those upon the spot. Our predecessors had discovered, as we should discover in the future, that the persons who best knew the requirements of a neighbourhood were those who lived close to it. The principles of this Bill were a reversal not only of the Act and experience of old times, but also of the policy of everybody interested in temperance reform for the past thirty years. Even the Majority Report of the Commission recommended that persons having local knowledge should be added to the licensing committees to the number of a third of the whole. In this matter theywere travelling in the wrong direction. He would have liked to have seen a large measure of local option and those who with himself held that opinion would have to oppose this Bill to the utmost. Up to now the magistrates had felt that they were responsible for the well-being and proper conduct of the public-houses in their neighbourhood, and the result of taking away that responsibility and giving it to persons who knew little about it would be that the magistrates would be averse to make reports to quarter sessions, because they would know less of the doings of public-houses than formerly. If the quarter sessions, on the other hand, did not happen to take great interest in this matter the result might be, if there were an active local bench, to tie the hands of that local bench and prevent anything in the nature of reductions being done, and so the powers of the public-houses would be increased.

It was proposed that the licensing authorities should not only be able to utilise the money derived year by year from taxation, but should be able to borrow upon it. There were two objections to this. In the first place the security would not be a good one to borrow on, and the price paid for the money borrowed would be a high one, and the power of the compensation fund would thereby be reduced. In the second place—and this was the graver objection—having once borrowed money on the fund, the hands of the licensing authorities would be tied, and they might be unable later to buy up a public-house which changed conditions of the neighbourhood might make it desirable to purchase. The incidence of the compensation tax, too, was unfair; the percentage of levy was small on small houses and rose to a higher figure on medium sized houses, but when it came to the biggest and most profitable houses, it ran down the scale in proportion as the value of the house increased, until an infinitesimal percentage was paid by the largest and most profitable houses. Some explanation should be given by the Government with regard to this. The medium sized houses were mostly country houses, in respect to which the chance of the licence being interfered with was very remote, yet they were to bear the largest burden in providing the fund to be used for the reduction of public-houses in towns, whose disappearance would not be to their benefit but to the benefit of the biggest and wealthiest public-houses in those towns, who would reap the whole of the profit. This was not justice, and he hoped before this Bill reached another stage to hear from the Government that at least the same tax which was levied on the medium houses should be levied on the largest and most profitable. The right hon. Gentleman the Colonial Secretary in speaking of compensation made the following amazing statement—

> "But the hon. Member would not deny that the peril of having these licences dealt with, was infinitesimal in the case of large hotels like the Euston, the Paddington, or the Métropole. Those hotels were asked to contribute very largely to the fund for the mutual insurance of their weaker brethren. That was what the scheme came to. This fund was a mutual insurance fund, and the large hotels paid some thousands a year in come cases to this fund by way of premium, though the risk run by them was very small.'

He believed that was an absolutely inaccurate statement of the case. As he read the Bill, no house, however large, would be taxed at more than £100 a year, and the amount of contribution was still further limited in the case of hotels. In the opinion of all fair-minded men these large houses were escaping their fair share of the tax. He submitted that a Bill of so serious a character ought not to have been introduced at the fag-end of a Parliament which was elected for the sole purpose of terminating the war, and not for the purpose of so dealing with a great social question as to transfer an enormous amount of property from the public to private individuals. He hoped the sense of injustice felt in many quarters, and the pressure of public opinion, would cause the Government either to withdraw the Bill or to effect such Amendments in it as would safeguard the rights of the public.

SIR E. DURNING-LAWRENCE (Cornwall, Truro) said that his constituents took a deep interest in all matters connected with temperance, and he himself had for more than thirty years striven hard to reduce the number of licences. In the year 1890 he wrote a letter in which he stated that fifteen years previously he had advocated the absolute suspension of the granting of new licences, with power to the magistrates to permit the transfer of licences from houses which were scheduled as being in excess of the reasonable wants of the neighbourhood to new localities where licensed houses were desirable or necessary. Under that scheme not a penny of compensation would have been paid by the outside public. When it was considered that London in a single year grew by as much as seventy-six miles of streets, it would be seen that the plan he then suggested (which he proposed should be for ten years certain in the first instance) would in a very few years have caused a considerable diminution in the relative number of licensed houses, and many of the resorts of thieves and bad characters would have disappeared. That having been his view for so many years, he could not bring himself to vote against a measure which so largely provided for the diminution of licences as did the Bill before the House. He did not pledge himself to vote for every clause in Committee, but believing the Bill to be an honest attempt to reduce the number of licences he felt it to be his duty to support the Government on the present occasion.

MR. SAMUEL YOUNG (Cavan, E.) said the Bill before the House was a short simple measure for the regulation of a legitimate trade which had been, and in all human probability would be, continued in this country. Its provisions were mainly applicable to the licensing authority and to compensation for undue disturbance. By its opponents one of the objections urged against it was that it weakened the influence of the magistrate and interfered with his functions. In his opinion this was one of the perfections of the Bill, but it did not go far enough in that direction. He had always held it to be a mistake to entrust the administration of the licensing laws to the local magistrate. It was to this magisterial licensing tribunal that all the troubles of the trade might fairly be ascribed, and the same body had led to an expensive Royal Licensing Commission and to the production of the Bill now before the House. In regard to the incompetence of the present system, the magistrates for a series of years granted and renewed licences in superabundance without due care. Then came a period when, as the result of some agitation, a desire set in to diminish the number of houses as a supposed means of reducing the consumption of liquor. That was a most fallacious idea in his opinion. These magistrates then set about closing up houses arbitrarily under the pretext that licences were granted for one year only, without recognising the fact that custom and usage created title. In many places in a most cruel manner, under a legal quibble, after structural alterations and much expenditure had been made, owners of property were deprived of their livings and turned out penniless. At Whitby alone, out of twenty-four licences refused at the last brewster sessions, seventeen were lost on appeal, of which no less than eleven belonged to one company, and the renewals were refused solely on the ground of redundancy. In his opinion the common bench of magistrates, composed of drapers, grocers, and men of extreme views holding all sorts of fads, who resided among the people, never should have been constituted the licensing tribunal. Consciously or unconsciously they were liable to be influenced. In the nature of things, being mixed up in business with the trading community, they were unfitted for the work. It appeared to him that well-paid Judges free from surrounding entanglements, as were the Judges of the High Courts, should administer the licensing laws in counties and cities; until this took place he feared there would be always trouble in the trade. Because this Bill was slightly in this direction he should support it. Those members from Ireland who sat with him on the Licensing Commission entertained these views, but the English members stuck to their old prejudices in favour of the control of the local magistrates. And he saw that Lord Peel, who was chairman of that Commission, still adhered to magisterial authority which had proved so disastrous to their whole licensing administration.

Might he say that a licence should be taken away, as asserted, from a well-conducted house after twelve months never was intended. The object in granting licences for only twelve months was for the purpose of being in a safe position to deal with licensees who misconducted their business, but certainly not for well-conducted places of business. He failed to see what the outside taxpayer had to do with compensation for disturbance. The trade in this respect was a self-contained corporation. It raised the money and did not ask the outside public for one farthing. It seemed to him that all this talk about compensation was not pertinent, and therefore impertinent. He thought the State and the public should be obliged to the trade for consenting to be taxed for the purpose of relieving the Legislature from a disagreeable position into which it had allowed itself to drift by the mismanagement of magisterial authority. It was said compensation created a vested interest, and, therefore, in the absence of a time limit, pointed to the permanent establishment of the drink traffic. Did any sane man believe that the drink traffic would ever cease? Professional agitators and stump orators might supply this sort of food to the ignorant people, but every sensible man knew that the trade would continue. Why should a time limit be asked for, unless it was for the purpose of renewing the troubles at a given time which this Bill sought to permanently end. It was said that a licence was a valuable gift. Might he point out that it only enabled man to enter upon a trade which was of no value whatever unless he exercised that care and industry which would secure success in any other business. The licensee had to expend large sums of money, to make his place suitable, in furniture, decorations, and often in structural alterations, and he had to pay heavy rates on the premises thus enhanced, and, at death, duties were levied on the amount of trade created not by the possession of a licence but by the industry of the licensee. A licence was rather the symbol of an appointment than a gift which in other departments the State often made. The magistrates had not to pay for their appointments, and so long as they did their duty the appointment was continued. One would think that so long as the licensee did his duty his authority to do business should be continued, especially since he helped materially to raise about £36,000,000 per annum for State expenses. Indeed, one would think a trade so useful to the Exchequer had reason to complain when called upon to impose a tax on itself to compensate those whose licences were taken away. A high dignitary of the Church had argued that because the trade could pay a large tax for compensation that therefore the State should impose this tax for the Exchequer. That was if a man denied himself luxuries to ensure his life, therefore the State should step in to levy that amount on him for the Exchequer. This was the sort of logic they were treated to by those who were opposing a good Bill which would diminish the number of houses and very much add to the respectability of the trade. It appeared to him that the Bill before the House was calculated to do an immense good and settle the question for years. He did not say it would diminish the consumption of liquor, for if they had twelve houses in a street and they closed six of them the remaining six would do the trade. He believed that the whole of this difficulty arose from the fact that they had had at the head of affairs a magisterial authority which had mismanaged the affairs of the trade for years.

*MR. AUSTIN TAYLOR (Liverpool, East Toxteth) said that he had a lurking sympathy with fanatics because they were the only people, as a rule, who got anything done. It might rest with others to put the coping-stone on their endeavours and appropriate the fruits of their labours, but, after all, it was with the fanatics that the passing of good social reforms rested. The hon. Member for Carnarvon brought a charge of want of political courage against the Government, but that appeared to be the last charge to which they had laid themselves open. They had bidden their supporters follow them "o'er many a frozen, many a fiery, Alp," and if in the onward march some of them fell into crevasses by the way or went down into the pit of political extinction, that, after all, was a mere detail incidental alike to political as to military operations. They had had considerable discussion as to what was or was not the principle of this Bill. He took it that this Bill was the outcome of what had been described as an *impasse*. It had also been described as an ignoble surrender to the brewers. He thought that was not quite an appropriate description of any transaction which might have taken place. The Government had conferred with what was known as "the trade," and in this Bill they had the fruits of that conference, and the measure appeared to bear the sign manual of both its parents. The principle of the Bill was the necessity of getting something done in the circumstances brought about by the action of the magistrates at brewster sessions. The monopoly of the traffic in liquor was described as the property of the community and the licensees were said to be the tenants from year to year of the community. The community through the magistrates had during the last few years endeavoured to re-enter into possession of this monopoly. It had endeavoured to do so without either giving notice to the present tenants of the monopoly or without paying them a penny of compensation, and the result was a revolt in the public mind and in the minds of the magistrates themselves against proceedings which neither gave due notice to the holders of the present licences nor offered them any compensation for summary eviction from their premises. He understood that a majority of the Members of the House accepted the principle that something must be done.

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the debate stood adjourned until this Evening's Sitting.

EVENING SITTING.

LICENSING BILL.

[Second Reading.]

Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on Amendment to Question [9th May], "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Which Amendment was —

> "To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day six months.'"—(*Mr. Burt.*)

Question again proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

*Mr. **AUSTIN TAYLOR**, continuing his speech, said he understood that the principle was accepted by a majority of the House that something must be done. If, to take an extreme case, the magistrates at brewster sessions decided to reduce the licences throughout the country by one-half, and on appeal to quarter sessions their decisions were confirmed, he believed that even the hon. Member for Carnarvon would admit that a clear case existed either for compensation or for some form of equitable treatment. He was convinced that it was the feeling of an overwhelming majority of the House that equity demanded that where licences were taken away compensation of some kind should be given. Some might favour the scheme embodied in that Bill, others might be in favour of a time limit, and others might prefer a combination of both, but he was convinced that neither the House nor the country was so oblivious to the primary instinct of justice as to desire to take away without compensation the interests of those who had entered into the licensed trade in the belief that they would meet with fair treatment and good faith on the part of the House of Commons. He believed there was substantial agreement on that point. All they had to examine was whether the methods of applying the principle of compensation under this Bill were such as would weaken or strengthen control over the trade.

He was in favour of reduction in the number of licences, believing that it would lead to a diminution of drinking. He believed, also, that the surplus house which had to contend with the keen competition of its neighbours was the worst kind of house that could be kept up, because, owing to that very competition, it was compelled sometimes to minister to drunkenness and debauchery in order to secure a few years of precarious existence. The Colonial Secretary had alluded to the reductions which had already taken place in Liverpool. Liverpool had taken the front rank in that movement, and while the magistrates there might have made mistakes, just as magistrates in other parts of the country might have done, on the whole they had endeavoured to do their duty. The point to be considered was whether this Bill would enable them to pursue their work, and whether it would be facilitated or delayed. In Liverpool during the last twelve years the total reduction from all causes had been 493 licences, an average of about forty per annum. According to a calculation made by the clerk to the Liverpool justices it was estimated that if this Bill passed, the reduction in the first year would be seventy licences. The clerk had, however, only taken the average value of a licence at £500, which seemed ridiculously small. Still he thought that if the Bill passed the work of suppression would go on with greater celerity than it had done in the past. The magistrates being able to grant compensation would not be restrained by a feeling that they were acting unfairly to those whose licences they refused to renew, and they would, he hoped, proceed to put the provisions of the Bill into operation. The Solicitor-General had spoken of the haphazard fashion in which at present licences were taken away as resembling a game of pitch-and-toss or a lottery, but he failed to perceive how this Bill would make a change in their methods in that respect. Under the Bill the compensation cases, the cases of redundant licences, would be heard by the whole Bench of magistrates in county boroughs, and then referred to a committee of the magistrates with the addition of the recorder as chairman. He did not understand that provision. It was said that the addition of the recorder would confer a judicial atmosphere which was needed but he thought that, in taking away redundant licences, what was required was not so much a judicial atmosphere as acquaintance with local conditions. He suggested as an Amendment to the Bill that the provisions in regard to dealing with redundant licences should be reversed, and that those cases should be considered first by the committee, who could make themselves acquainted with the condition prevailing in large centres, and that their decision should go on appeal to the whole body of magistrates.

There had been considerable discussion in regard to a time limit, and the Colonial Secretary had attempted to make out a case against it, and had said that the measure would require remodelling if such a limit were introduced. He felt very strongly that the right hon. Gentleman did not make out his case. It was true that if a time limit were imposed those who had licences would be paying during whatever period might be fixed towards the compensation fund, and those who survived would be paying out of the fund for the extinction of their weaker neighbour; but, on the other hand, they would be receiving automatic compensation in the form of the trade of those houses whose licences were extinguished, unless it were assumed that drinking would diminish in exact ratio to the number of licences extinguished, a point upon which he did not profess to dogmatise. Could it with any satisfaction be considered that the House should convert into an absolutely statutory freehold what was to-day only a precarious tenure with a certain moral claim to equitable treatment? There was another point in the Bill which, looking to the future, required consideration. That was the provision which enabled the magistrates to grant new licences as against the transfer of licences in congested districts. The result of that might be that they would find competition in new districts, and those brewers who happened to be favoured with licences to surrender in the older parts of the town would be in the best position. That might not work altogether for the benefit of the community. It might militate against such a trust as Earl Grey's Trust, which, having no licences to offer, might be unable to bid before the magistrates. Taking the whole circumstances into account, he felt very strongly that this Bill could not receive his support unless something in the nature of a time limit was introduced into it. He felt very strongly that while they desired to act equitably towards the trade and to secure it against anything like ill-treatment, hasty eviction, or partial proceedings of any kind, they had also a duty to the community at large. For his own part he should not feel satisfied that he had performed his duty if no opportunity were offered in the Bill for a review at a future period of the situation as between the community and the trade. Some time might elapse before the full effects of the Bill were realised, and it might be desirable in the interests of the community and of the trade that an opportunity should be given for a complete review of the position at the expiration of a definite term of years. He was most anxious to see something done to facilitate a reduction of licences, and he was most anxious to see magistrates enabled to proceed with that work unhampered by a sense of committing injustice; but at the same time he felt most strongly that whatever they did in that session should not close the book, as this Bill appeared to close it, upon the great cause of temperance reform, but that a definite provision should be inserted in the Bill so that they, or their children at any rate, should have an opportunity of reverting to the *status quo.*

* MR. TOMKINSON (Cheshire, Crewe) said that in the short space of time which had elapsed since this Bill was introduced he had received petitions, resolutions, letters, and telegrams from his constituents to an extent unequalled in his experience. His first objection to the Bill was that, as regarded the magisterial attitude and action, it was wholly unnecessary and unjustifiable. They had had statistics given by the hon. Member for Spen Valley, showing what the result of the magisterial action had been, and he asked upon what ground this agitation had been started? It would not be incorrect to say that the total number of licences taken away because they were not required would not exceed 180 out of 130,000. One would think that the magistrates, previous to this, had not been acting in a similiar manner. In Liverpool, however, between 1889 and 1902 the actual reduction in licences was 345. The result was that the annual arrests for drunkenness fell from 15,042 to 4,180, and the number of the police were reduced by one hundred, despite that there was a continuously increasing population. In the case of Blackburn, too, the number of licences had been reduced from 599 in 1883 to 417 in the present year; the number of convictions of licence-holders had fallen from thirty-nine to seven, and the number of prosecutions for drunkenness had decreased from 989 to 624, this despite the fact that within the period named the population had increased in number by 30,000. Could anyone say that the action of the magistrates in those great cities had been anything but beneficial? The Colonial Secretary in his speech on the previous day said that those on the Liberal side of the House opposed compensation, and he dwelt on the grave injury which would be inflicted on the *bona-fide* owner of a free house who suffered because there were too many public-houses in the district. He did not think that there was any ground for supposing that such a licence would be selected by the magistrates when the time came for a reduction when the great majority of licences would belong to a great brewery company. He did not think anyone would say that such a case would not be a hardship, and that he would not be entitled to compensation out of the funds provided for the extinction of the licence.

It seemed to him that there was one obvious answer in regard to compensation, and that was that the trade should insure for the whole of their property. He should like to give the House an apposite instance of what happened under the Workman's Compensation Act of 1897. It was pointed out with great force that the provisions of the Act might bear very hardly on good employers. In the case of colliery owners, they might spare no pains, trouble, and expense to preserve the lives and limbs of their employees, but it was impossible to prevent a careless and negligent man occasionally taking a match into the mine, striking it, and causing an explosion. It was very hard that the employers who had done their best to prevent it should be mulcted in damages for the act of that man. The reply of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham or of Sir Matthew White Ridley was that employers had their remedy in insurance. He could say, as the director of a large colliery, that they insured for every risk and that accidents were hardly known. The insurance came to about a halfpenny per ton on the output. There never was a case in which insurance was so obviously the recourse of a trade as that of the liquor traffic. They had a monopoly and were practically protected from competition from the outside, and, therefore, every licence taken away enhanced the value of the monopoly and enabled them to contribute to the compensation of those who were refused renewals on grounds of public policy. The Colonial Secretary also said that quarter sesssions would be a more just, firm, and able administrative body in the case of reductions than the petty sessional bench because, forsooth, the latter was composed of amiable gentlemen who played cricket or engaged in other sports with the licensees and would, therefore, not be so able or willing to enforce the law as the magistrates of quarter sessions. It was the first time he had heard that such a state of things existed. His experience was that petty sessions knew the requirements of a neighbourhood and the blemishes of certain public-houses, but when they refused a licence they found that their decision was over-ruled by quarter sessions, the magistrates who sat in the first instance being precluded by usage from sitting on the case in the Court of quarter sessions. It seemed to him that neither of the positions taken up by the right hon. Gentleman would hold water for a moment. What houses were threatened under magisterial action? Certainly not the large hotels and restaurants. It was the mere drinking shops that did such infinite harm in the country. He opposed this Bill because he believed that it would not promote sobriety or temperance, but rather entrench the trade more firmly than ever, that it would give practically a freehold and make more difficult and costly the reduction of licences.

*Sir THOMAS DEWAR (Tower Hamlets, St. George's) said he considered this Bill was well conceived and cleverly drafted, and so far as the complications which had been set up through the decisions of the High Court during the past ten years could be met, the Bill would serve that purpose. Although the Bill had not been received with enthusiasm by those in whose favour it had been drafted, they recognised that it established a compulsory mutual insurance, to be carried on through the machinery of Somerset House, to recompense within the limits of the fund raised the proprietors of licences which were extinguished to meet local popular ideas. Much had been said about the power being taken away from brewster sessions and given to quarter sessions, but it was obvious that they would still be able to co-operate for the destruction of property without calling on the limited fund at their control, because the continuance of a licence would still depend on the good conduct of a tenant, failing which there was to be no compensation. Although the Bill was not exactly all that could be desired, he recognised that the Home Secretary had done the best he could with a most difficult problem. When this Bill passed into law a licence would be worth something while the proprietor was alive—a very different state of things from what had existed in the past when a licence was worth nothing until his death, when the authorities came to levy death duties on his estate. The question of reduction of licences was not one affecting the brewers and temperance party only. Licences were established for the convenience of the public, and if a greater number were taken away than the public cared about a revulsion of feeling might set in as happened in 1830, when no less than 30,000 licences were established in a short space of time. History might repeat itself, and they might find themselves in the same position. He considered the action of the magistrates in the past was in a great measure responsible for the complicated position to-day. With some Amendments in Committee this Bill should go a long way to alleviate the distress which had existed in the minds of thousands of licence - holders for many years. It should inspire confidence and encourage a better and a more substantial class of men to carry on and continue in the business. Two great principles were embodied in the Bill—security of holding, and compensation, and although the compensation was to come from the compensated, yet for the sake of compromise they were resigned to the position, trusting that the money subscribed would not be handed over for the purpose of technical education, or to enable the London County Council to construct tramways on the Embankment or over Westminster Bridge. He believed if the measure introduced thirteen years ago by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Croydon and Lord Goschen had passed into law there would have been at least 10,000 less licences in England now. He supported this Bill because he believed it represented a fair compromise as between the public and the publicans.

Mr. CROOKS (Woolwich) said he was delighted to follow the hon. Member for St. George's, because he did not think there was a place in the kingdom that could equal St. George's-in-the-East for poverty and public-houses. He went further. He did not think there was a place in the kingdom where there was so many tied houses. He thought the Bill ought to be re-named. It ought to be called the Brewers' Endowment Bill. They could not make it anything else, because everyone who had spoken had said that there was property in a licence, and that the licence-holder ought to be compensated. But the licence-holder would not get any compensation in 90 per cent. of the cases under this Bill. If the poor publican's measures were short he was summoned and fined, but a brewer might send him a short measure and somehow the law supported him in that. He could do it with impunity. There were gentlemen in this House connected with the business who could corroborate that statement.

He had a few questions to put to the Home Secretary. First of all, if petty sessions could only make a recommendation for the extinction of a licence to quarter sessions, would they have to vote on the question in quarter sessions, and if not why not? They had as much right to go up and vote for the recommendation as Members of this House had to vote for the recommendation of a Committee of which they were members. He wished also to ask who was going to fix the value of these houses. Everyone knew that the question of £1,000,000 a year was a mere blind. It would not close many houses, if any at all. How was the valuation to be arrived at? Would the valuation be arrived at for the purposes of compensation or the purposes of assessment? The law had settled long ago that no portion of a premium paid for goodwill could be rated. He instanced a case in which £3,000 was paid for the goodwill and £3,000 for the ordinary lease. Probably the occupier only put in £500 in actual cash, £5,500 being lent to him by the brewers or distillers. A large number of licence-holders were mere tenants at will, and could be turned out at almost a minute's notice. Would the Home Secretary state for the information of the House the number of licence-holders who were in that position? In connection with transactions of this kind brewers were unwilling to write the capital down, but they had not been unwilling to reduce the interest on the capital. The Bill endowed the brewers beyond all their wildest dreams. It was said that the teetotalers went for the publican as if he were a hunted beast; but when the publican found he could not pay his way, and approached the brewer to tell him so, what did the brewer say? "Get out." "But," said the tenant, "cannot I put this house on the market and sell it?" "What do you mean?" said the brewer. "It is our house; get out as soon as you can, otherwise we shall take steps to recover the £5,500 we lent you." And the man was glad to get out with the total loss of the £500 which he had put into the business. Let it be supposed that it had been decided to shut up this particular house as unnecessary. The publican who had the property in the licence found himself bought out, and he went down to the brewers for his share of the compensation in respect of his original investments of £500. The value of the house for the purpose of compensation would be the assessment value, that was to say, £3,000. The brewer would say to the publican, "You want to share this £3,000, do you? Why, when you went into that house it was worth £6,000. Moreover, we hold your acknowledgment of a debt to us of £5,500. You pay that debt before you get a share of this compensation." He never found a brewer to give anything away, and when the division of the spoil came along, the poor licence-holder would get nothing from it. A man who had a freehold house was quite a different person altogether. He had a letter from a publican who had a free house, in which he stated that a London firm of brewers who owned 1,500 tied houses, had offered to sell him beer at 15s. a barrel less than they charged for the beer supplied to their own tied houses. That was how the brewery companies ran up their big dividends.

The proposal of the surrender of old licences for new ones was like the tale of selling new lamps for old ones. There were many which were an absolute loss to the brewers and distillers, but they were kept open because they had a licence, and that licence was property, and it had a value. He knew of a case in which three licences were surrendered for one. The brewers had put men in these three houses at a weekly wage, to keep the licences alive.

The only customers were the brewers themselves. Then the brewers went before the magistrates and moralised about the virtue of keeping the number of licences down. They said they were anxious to assist the Bench to the fullest extent to reduce the number of licences, and that they were prepared to make a sacrifice. They laid an emphasis on the word "sacrifice." They would sacrifice three licences if the magistrates would grant them one licence for a tavern in a most respectable neighbourhood. The tavern was situated in a working-class district, and when the workman was tired he did not want to travel far for his beer, and, of course, it was in the interest of the working man that the licence should be granted. And the Bench was touched visibly. The emotion of the chairman was as much as he could bear, and he said—

> "We accept with gratitude the broad-minded views expressed by you in the interests of the morality of this poor district, and we are delighted that you should join in this movement for the reduction of licences. I am merely echoing the sentiments of my colleagues on the Bench when I say that your action is a matter for great congratulation."

The three licences were surrendered, and one was given in exchange, and they all shook hands and left the court. Aye, but what became of the three poor fellows who had the property in the licence? One obtained a job at a guinea a week, and another got an order for the workhouse. He had not heard what had become of the third, possibly he might be in the river. He had not heard that any of them had received compensation. If they were to have temperance legislation, if they were to have a Licensing Bill, let them have a Bill to deal with the people who were injured, not to compensate those who had already too much. This, indeed, would be a brewers' endowment Bill. If these licences were as valuable as they had been represented to be, it was strange that they changed hands so frequently as they did. It was not the publicans' side of the question that had been put before the House, but only the brewers' side. The brewers were rich, had enormous influence, and could get their case pleaded most eloquently; but the fact was that the man who owned the property in the way of a licence was a mere tool in the hands of the brewers, and under this Bill he would be in a worse position than ever before. To sum up, if a licensed house had the value that the brewer put upon it, then the House should insist upon his paying rates on that value. There ought also to be a Return showing the number of servants employed on licensed premises. This was a Bill imposed on tired and weary men by clever people, who were going to make much out of it, and safeguard their own interests. The tired and weary men said they should be glad when the Bill was finished, and for goodness sake let it be pushed through the House. He hoped the House would push it out.

MR. CORBETT (Glasgow, Tradeston) said he thought the House was indebted to the hon. Member for Woolwich for his brilliant and eloquent speech. It contrasted favourably with the speech of the hon. Member who first spoke from his own side of the House, a Gentleman who was a considerable authority on this question and was largely interested in the trade, and those in whose interests the Bill had been drafted. He did not think that any measure had ever been introduced making a revolutionary change in a system which had prevailed for centuries that had so little justification. For three-and-a-half centuries, licences had been granted for one year, and one year only, so far as the law was concerned, and now it was proposed to convert those licences into a permanent freehold. And what was the ground for that? It was alleged that certain individuals might suffer losses which they could not have anticipated, owing to the action of the magistrates. Examples of cases of hardship had been brought before the licensing magistrates by Sir Ralph Littler, and other cases had been cited by the President of the Licensed Victuallers' National Defence League, when the Prime Minister received a deputation from that body. In not one of the cases, to which he would refer, would the individual licensee have received one farthing compensation under this Bill. One of the cases brought forward was that of a poor widow who was said to have spent £790 in order to meet the requirements of the licensing magistrates. Now Lord Peel pointed out that this £790 had not been spent by the poor widow at all, but by a firm of brewers, so that it was clear that the poor widow could not recover under the Bill money which she had never expended. The only answer that Sir Ralph Littler could give to that statement was, that it did not matter whether the money was paid by the brewers or by the widow; that it would be no consolation to Lord Peel if his house had been broken into by burglars to be told that the money taken by the burglars was not his but his butler's. The loss to the brewers' company had been amply covered by their other gains, and it showed to what straits the defenders of the trade were put when they brought forward this case as if there had been a loss of a large sum by a poor widow. The other case mentioned by Sir Ralph Littler was that of a man who paid £200 on going into the house. But Lord Peel showed that on the man's own evidence he had paid nothing at all for the goodwill, but for furniture and fittings, and in this case the man would receive no compensation under the Bill. So much for Sir Ralph Littler's cases. The first speaker from the deputation to the Prime Minister was Mr. Morrell, President of the Licensed Victuallers' Defence League, who said—

> "I feel justified in demanding protection on behalf of the licence-holders of the country from such iniquitous interference. I would like to show by a few examples the cruel wrong done to licence-holders, whose property is taken away for no misconduct, inasmuch as they have for years conducted their houses properly as law-abiding citizens. (1) F. Beeston, owner and occupier of the 'Swan Inn,' fully licenced, Basingstoke. House left to him by his father thirty years ago, in whose possession it had previously been for about forty years. During the whole of the seventy years, there had been no conviction or complaint from the place. At the brewster sessions the licence was taken away on the ground that it was not required."

Now this case as presented had no aspect of the tied house about it, and one would suppose that the licensed premises was a real old-fashioned inn. But the House would be surprised to hear that the man Beeston was not the occupant of the premises. He was a wheelwright at Hook, six miles from Basingstoke. The occupier of the premises for over thirty years was a Mistress Barnes, a widow, and the house, which was very old, was leased to the Farnham United Breweries Company, Ltd. The lease held by that company had expired on the previous November, and they continued to hold the house on a yearly tenancy. Now what compensation under this Bill would the licensee of that house get when the Breweries Company only held it as a yearly tenant? Another case quoted by Mr. Morrell was—

> "Walter Hill, tenant and owner of the 'Tanners Arms,' Canterbury, over eighty years of age. Licence refused in consequence of the house not being structurally adapted, and because of advanced age of licensee, and on grounds of non-requirement. Mr. Hill had conducted the house without any complaint from the police for upwards of fifty years."

What were the facts? The licensee's name was not Hill, but Sutton. He was an old man of over eighty years of age, so infirm and unfit to conduct any business whatever that those who saw him in Court had no doubt as to whether the magistrates could regard him as a fit and proper person to hold a licence. The evidence given by the city surveyor showed that the house was unfit for habitation, that its sanitary condition was very bad, and, as the chairman put it, it was contended that the house could only be made structurally fit by complete rebuilding. The man's age and infirmities were such, that the police said that practically the house was without a responsible head at all, and that if only one tipsy man made a disturbance in it there would be no person there who could deal with it. For a long time there had been practically no trade, and Sutton, who was the owner of the house, apparently wished to end his days in the place, and so was unwilling to hand over the house to anyone else. There were half a dozen houses within 130 yards, but the magistrates did not appear to take special cognisance of this latter fact as they refused the licence on the ground that Sutton's age and infirmities, coupled with the fact that he had no one except himself to deal with the trade at all, rendered him unfit to hold a licence. Could anyone believe that under such conditions any compensation could be received under the Bill? It was a striking proof of the great discretion or moderation of the magistrates, or, as he thought, of the practical universality of insurance, that when Sir Ralph Littler tried to put the case at its best and when a great deputation came before the Prime Minister to give special cases of hardship, they could not name one instance of such hardship as a measure like the present would meet.

They had been told that the measure had been introduced for the purpose of reducing the number of licences, and after the very important speech by the hon. Member for the Spen Valley he would not deal with the cases of particular districts. He would only say that the cases cited could not be disproved. The hon. Member for York had charged Mr. Arthur Chamberlain with ridiculous exaggeration in the figures he had used as to the value of licences which were refused renewal at Birmingham, but the hon. Member should have spoken more respectfully of them, because they were the figures of the chairman of a brewery company. That gentleman, the chairman of the Holt Brewery Company, at the annual meeting of the shareholders last February, said the cost ran from £1,350 per house in one area to £2,050 in another, and if that was the value of such houses in Birmingham it would be difficult to show that it would be less in a city like Liverpool. One Gentleman, who always addressed the House with considerable authority upon matters of this sort—the right hon. Member for Ripon—put before them the exact facts with regard to cases which had come before him as chairman of quarter sessions. He gave two illustrations which were calculated to throw some light on the matter, and which bore out the figures quoted by the hon. Member for the Spen Valley. The estimates were based on the idea that town licences were worth £1,000 and country ones £500. The right hon. Gentleman spoke of two cases in which he would have refused renewal had he had the power proposed to be conferred by this Bill. In one case the tenant had spent £300 in putting the premises in order to meet the requirements of the magistrates, and that £300 represented the minimum; there was to be added to it the value of the goodwill. In the other case the tenant had invested £1,000 of his own and had borrowed £1,400, so that the value was £2,400. They had enough evidence of the general character of this Bill to prevent anyone voting for it on the ground that it would reduce the number of licences. If it would reduce licences it would not have been introduced with arguments designed to prove that a reduction of licences did not mean a reduction of intemperance.

One of the most serious aspects of this question was the deliberate offer of the trade to support whichever Party would give it this thing. One of the leaders of the trade, who had been described as the "Lord Roberts" of the campaign, declared he did not think anybody would say that the trade were unreasonable in their demand, but the trade had to be reckoned with, and any Government which treated it fairly might depend on its support. His own opinion was, however, that it was only the Conservative and Unionist Party that was likely to treat the trade fairly. That was a striking illustration of the kind of pressure the trade exercised. The Secretary for India had indulged, too, in a significant criticism. Referring to the pledges given in the past, the right hon. Gentleman coolly declared—according to the *Licensing World* that—

> "The position of affairs was now wholly altered,"

and that the alteration consisted of the fact that it had been discovered that, as the law now stood—

> "Licences could be taken away by magistrates without any other cause than that there were too many in a particular district."

> "A more absurd and puerile excuse for backing out of a distinct pledge was never put forward."

said the *Licensing World*—

> "the fact that magistrates had the power to refuse the renewal of licences on the ground that they were not wanted was known to every intelligent individual long before Mr. Brodrick entered upon his political career."

He felt that a measure of this character, brought forward under such conditions, was a discreditable measure. He was very anxious that the intensity of his feeling should not betray him into too strong language, but he did say that if the Government had realised the sin and the sorrow connected with this question, as they ought to have done, such a measure would never have been brought before the House.

*MR. EMMOTT (Oldham) said the House had listened to three very remarkable speeches—all of them extremely illuminating. He certainly never heard anything so illuminating as the speech of the hon. Member for St. George's-in-the-East. He would try not to misinterpret the hon. Member, so he had taken down his words. He told them that the Bill was well conceived and well drafted, although it had not been well received by those in whose favour it had been drawn. He told them, too, that the licenses were worth nothing while the licensees were alive. Could a more convincing argument have been put into the hands of the hon. Member for Camborne when he desired to prove that licences were worth nothing at all. The hon. Member admitted, too, that licences existed for the convenience of the public, and he added that the distrust in the minds of the owners of the licences was alleviated somewhat by the promises offered in the Bill. All these were exactly the kind of statements which the temperance party made most use of. The hon. Member for Woolwich threw a very strong light in his speech on the point of view of the tenants of tied houses. One of the great complaints to be made against the Bill was that no account was taken of, and no attempt was made to remedy, the wretched and abominable system of tied houses which had grown up to so large an extent in this country. Then they had had from the hon. Member for the Tradeston Division of Glasgow the first really outspoken temperance speech from the Government side of the House—a speech which had given them great pleasure. He was going to follow the example set by other speakers—although he was not sure it was a good one—of saying what his exact position was. He was not a teetotaler, but he looked at the question from the standpoint of a magistrate, and of a director of a public-house trust. He could not understand why such an enormous amount of time had been wasted in trying to prove that compensation was necessary. He could not conceive that any scheme could be accepted by that House unless there was some measure of compensation, and all this talk about compensation was a mere waste of time except in so far as it was directed to the amount that was to be raised and how it was to be applied.

SIR WILFRID LAWSON: And who is to get it?

*MR. EMMOTT said he suffered long ago on the question of compensation. Twenty-five years since he presided at a temperance lecture, and then expressed an opinion that whenever this question was settled compensation would have to given, and subsequently the whole of the lecture was directed against him for having made that remark. Still he remained of the same opinion. Both sides, he believed, were honestly anxious for reform in this matter. Hon. Member after hon. Member opposite had advocated a time limit. He hoped it might be possible to introduce such a limit. He should support it if it were introduced, but he would point out that in so doing they would be introducing something which was entirely different from the basis on which the Bill was now laid down. The meaning of the Bill was that they were to make a small reduction of licences, but were to leave the monopoly in the hands of those who now possessed it. But the essence of a time limit was that at the expiry of the period the licensing authority should be at liberty to give the licences to whomsoever it pleased, and it would not be likely to give them to those who would again create a monopoly. Therefore, the introduction of a time limit would knock the original idea of the Bill out of time altogether. He was in favour of a time limit, because he did not see how any real temperance reform could take place unless the liquor trade was controlled by the public for the public. Much light had been thrown on this question by the Reports of the Royal Commission, the epoch-making works of Messrs. Sherwell and Rowntree, and the experiments of the Public-house Trust. His conclusions were that local veto could at best be but a partial remedy, and that high licence duties would be a temptation to the publican to push the sale of drink in order to make up the amount of the increased tax. Their ideal should be that no private person should be interested in pushing the sale of drink; that nobody interested in public-houses should feel that he must support one political Party or the other because of his trade. The association of trade with politics had a corrupting influence which both Parties would be glad to get rid of, In the next place the profits ought to go to the Exchequer, or in providing counter attractions; and, lastly, it ought to be clearly laid down that they were not going to allow public-houses for people to sit in solely for the purpose of drinking. Those were the ideals at which they ought to aim; and it was obviously manifest that in order to achieve those ideals they must get rid of the present monopoly. No one would recommend that it should be bought out by public money; and they must either have a time limit or a scheme of rapid reduction with compensation. He did not believe they could achieve any real reform without some scheme of compensation.

At present they had a system of licensing which, with the exception of the ante-1869 beerhouses, made licences renewable at discretion every year; but although they need not be renewed the practice was to renew them with three or four exceptions in every thousand. They also had this most important consideration, that owing to reductions in the number of public-houses the trade had become more valuable; and therefore there was an unearned increment in the trade. This Bill proposed to establish a vested interest. It would put practically all licences in the position of the ante-1869 beerhouses. On the other hand it taxed the trade for a small compensation fund. Estimates had been given as to what that tax would achieve in the way of reduction. The figures given by Mr. Arthur Chamberlain had been called into question; but he proposed to put the matter in the most favourable light he could. Assuming that the £1,200,000 was to be capitalised, he would sk how many public-houses could be extinguished. It would not pay for more than 20 per cent. or 25 per cent. of the existing licences, or, at any rate, not more than 20 per cent. or 25 per cent. of the total value of existing licences; and the result would be that the remaining 75 per cent. or 80 per cent. would have an increased value and their holders would still be interested in pushing the sale of drink, which was a system they ought to try and get rid of if they could. Further, if the Bill passed, it would be a great many years before Parliament could touch the subject again. Under those circumstances, the tax proposed in the Bill was practically no tax at all, because of the increased value which the licences left would possess. But instead of capitalising the tax, if it were used year by year for buying out licences, what would be the result in ten or fifteen years? How was the system of valuation going to be carried out? How was a house going to be valued as if the Bill had not been passed? He knew of no precedent for that. There was a precedent in Wales where the people were refusing to pay rates for educational purposes, just as if the Bill of 1902 had never been passed; but the Government did not sympathise with their action, and beyond that he knew of no precedent for levying rates or making valuations as if a certain Act had not been passed. He did not believe in the practicability of it. As far as he could see the only way of carrying out such a system was to value the licensed houses here and now and to provide that they could be bought out at any time at the valuation at which they stood at present. Otherwise, he did not see how the Bill would work.

There was also the unearned increment to be considered. The value of the houses would be increased, and that was why they contended, as moderate reformers, that this Bill was really not a reform at all, or, at any rate, was not a reform which would bring about in a reasonable time the abolition of private monopoly of the drink traffic, but that in a sense it rivetted the trade more firmly on the shoulders of the public by making the introduction of a time limit more difficult in the future than in the past. They were told that a time limit would be no use; and that at the end of it the position of things would be just as they were to-day. He maintained that the resources of civilisation were not exhausted, and that it was quite possible to draw up legisation by which the real ownership of licences should, after a stated period, be given into the hands of those who would work them under the general principles of the Publichouse Trust and devote the profits to public purposes. It had been said that the limits of the taxation of the trade had by no means been reached in this Bill, and that as regarded the time limit there were other ways of dealing with that question. An hon. Gentleman opposite suggested that the compensation fund might be larger. After all, the trade was a monopoly; and they were all agreed that in regard to a commodity which was of a monopoly character the consumer did pay the tax, and if the consumer paid, the compensation fund ought to be larger than was suggested in the Bill and ought to be raised compulsorily. The whole of the fund need not be used for extinguishing licences and, a part of it might be available at the expiration of a time limit for the then holders of licences, and, with regard to its division, if the licence-holders could not agree, they could employ arbitrators to decide for them. What he wished to point out was that if the time limit were really necessary and were the only real remedy, it could be put in this Bill or some other Bill; and if they wished at some future time to get rid of this private monopoly they should work all they could for a time limit. If the Government were going to stick to the Bill as it was, if they were prepared to maintain the present monopoly and merely curtail the number of licences, they would not solve the difficulty.

So far he had appealed to hon. Gentlemen who really desired temperance reform. He now wished to refer to the two Ministers who were chiefly responsible for the Bill, namely, the Prime Minister and the Home Secretary. Although he could understand the position of hon. Gentlemen who intended to vote for the Bill yet desired a time limit, he could not understand the position of the Prime Minister or the Home Secretary. The Prime Minister, on the First Reading, said that one of the great reasons for the Bill was, that if greater certainty were introduced as regarded the renewal of licences, the tenants would be of a more respectable character. He wished the Prime Minister had been present when his hon. friend the Member for Woolwich was speaking. His hon. friend put his finger on the cause of the non-respectability of many publicans. The tied-house system constituted a state of things which was a menace to public morality and which ought to be forcibly put down. He was quite sure that the Prime Minister did not understand the question at all if he maintained that this Bill would increase the respectability of the tenants, as long as the tied-house system remained untouched. In the borough of Crewe, the magistrates had been making great efforts to deal with the system and had really brought about a great improvement. Again the Prime Minister admitted the other day that he knew nothing of the notorious scandals which had occurred because of a section of the trade in Manchester attempting to corrupt the police. He did not bring it forward as a charge against the Prime Minister, but he did say that the Prime Minister held his ears very wide open to the woes of the brewers, but had not considered the other side of the question—the serious side of the question as displayed by the scandals which had occurred in his own constituency, and which were worthy of the attention of anyone who looked at the question all round. There also appeared to be confusion in the mind of the Prime Minister as to the administrative and judicial functions of the Licensing Bench. The Prime Minister actually invited quarter sessions to refuse to confirm the decisions of brewster sessions in regard to the diminution of public-houses. He entirely agreed with what was said by an hon. Gentleman opposite with reference to the scandalous way in which the Benches at quarter sessions were packed. He received a few years ago a letter asking him to attend at quarter sessions to vote against the renewal of a licence and he replied somewhat angrily that a letter such as that would induce him to vote for the renewal. When he attended quarter sessions he tried to cultivate a judicial frame of mind and to decide all cases on their merits. He thought the Prime Minister took a wrong view altogether in the advice he gave quarter sessions, because quarter sessions ought to regard those questions in a judicial spirit and not as an administrative matter.

The Home Secretary in introducing the Bill said he saw no relation between the number of licences and drunkenness, and when he was asked why then was the Bill introduced, he replied—with what struck him as a woman's reason—because it was desirable that such a reduction should take place. Surely that was the essence of the matter, and surely there was sufficient information to enable the right hon. Gentleman to give a better answer. What about the first half of the eighteenth century, the time of cheap drink? Again, from 1790 to 1820 there was a great diminution of crime which was directly attributable to a diminution in the liquor traffic, and after 1810 was there not a great increase in drunkenness and crime caused by the free trade in licences? There was ample information to show that there was a direct relationship between careful administration and a diminution of licences and the diminution of drunkenness. If there was not a relation between the number of licensed houses and drunkenness, why was the intelligence of the House insulted, and its time wasted, by bringing in a Bill whose main purpose was said to be the reduction of licences.

There were many details in the Bill which he regarded as very serious, but the most serious criticism he had to offer in regard to it was that the discretion and power of the local justices in petty sessions would be enormously interfered with. It was well known that five years before the Child Messenger Act was passed the Liverpool justices had enforced its principle simply by telling the publicans that if they did not enforce it their licences would be taken away. Publicans now gave promises at brewster sessions, because they knew that the magistrates had the power of enforcing the reforms they desired. That power was now to be taken away; and that was one of the most serious blots on the Bill. It was with regret that he would oppose the Bill. If this were the only way of providing for a reduction of licences he agreed with his hon. friend the Member for Leith Burghs, who made an excellent speech, that he should have felt bound to support it. In a sense the Bill was better than nothing; but he believed that there was a much better way of bringing about the reforms they all desired. The Bill put a barrier in the broad way on which he preferred to travel. It placed no assignable end which any man could foresee to the principle of private monopoly, which they all professed should be got rid of, and, in these circumstances, he was somewhat reluctantly forced to vote against the Second Reading.

*MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE (Somersetshire, E.) said the hon. Gentleman for Oldham had delivered a very carefully reasoned speech against the Bill. The hon. Gentleman's object and his object were not very different; yet he should support the Bill and he would tell the House why. The hon. Gentleman conceded, what had not been generally conceded by hon. Gentlemen opposite, that in dealing with the question of the reduction of licences there must be compensation. He (Mr. Hobhouse) conceived that the principle of the Bill was to establish a compensation fund with a view to reducing the number of licensed houses; and it was on that principle that he would support the Bill. There had been for many years past a strong desire in this country to reduce the number of public-houses; and they all knew how many abortive attempts had been made in this direction by both Parties. If that were so, was it not a little unwise to throw away what might be a favourable opportunity of doing something in this direction. He himself did not approve of many of the clauses of the Bill. He should vote for the Second Reading in the hope that important alterations would be made in Committee. He had long been satisfied that it was impossible to get any ordinary bench of magistrates to suppress any considerable number of public-houses, however desirable in the interests of the neighbourhood that suppression might be, unless they had power to grant compensation in some form. But while he favoured the formation of a compensation fund, he was opposed to conferring upon every owner of a licence a perpetual vested interest, and to any drastic interference with the discretion of magistrates. The compensation fund should be used as an assistance, not as a hindrance.

He had no rooted objection to the alteration of procedure as proposed in the Bill with regard to quarter sessions. At present, quarter sessions were the authority which ultimately determined whether or not a licence should be renewed. Under the Bill they would still be the authority but they would have very little discretion. They would have either to continue the licence or to refuse it and pay compensation. He thought quarter sessions ought to have more discretion than that; they ought to be enabled to treat the equitable claim of the licence-holder in an equitable manner. There were all degrees of equity; hard cases undoubtedly arose; but under the Bill as at present drawn every claim would have to be treated alike, according to a uniform rule, without any allowance for the equity of the case. It was not necessary to discuss at the present stage the exact basis of compensation, but it was desirable that the House should have some more definite information as to the rule which now prevailed in regard to the valuation of licensed premises for Inland Revenue purposes. He understood they were valued on the assumption that the licence would be renewed indefinitely. Such a basis of compensation might be equitable in some cases, but in others it certainly would not be. A house of a low class ought not to receive compensation on the same scale as a house of a superior character. This was shown by the fact that at present a considerable number of licences were voluntarily abandoned. They were confessedly of little value, and discretion in such cases ought to be given to the quarter sessions in administering the compensation. The Government trusted the quarter sessions in respect of the distribution of compensation between the parties interested and in the important matter of the issue of new licences; they were not a new authority; they were not likely to be composed chiefly or largely of prejudiced teetotalers; they were accustomed to act on judicial lines; and he thought they might fairly be trusted with a certain amount of discretion. Such a discretion, he believed, would be more satisfactory in the end than a time limit. There were great difficulties in connection with a time limit, in whatever form it was proposed. He could not help thinking that by the formation of a compensation fund coupled with a certain discretion in the licensing authority, they would be able to satisfy the equitable claims of those who were likely to suffer, and at the same time to safeguard the interests of the public to a much greater extent than was possible under the Bill.

Another essential was that full weight should be given to local knowledge and local information, and for that purpose a proper report from each licensing bench on the general position of licensed houses in their particular district was necessary. It was not sufficient to have a reference as to individual houses, as proposed by the Bill; the quarter sessions would be unable satisfactorily to administer the fund unless they had from time to time a general review of the position throughout the whole county. The fund would be strictly limited, and it was difficult to find out how far in any particular county it would go. It was very misleading to argue that, because the fund represented a certain proportion of the total value of the houses in the country, therefore only that proportion of houses would be abolished. By far the larger number of houses that had to be given up were of comparatively little value; therefore it was necessary to know not only the amount of the fund, but the number of public-houses and their different classes and values. Without such Amendments as he had suggested they would have a limited fund in each county which would be soon exhausted, and an enhanced value would be given to the houses which remained. It was most important that more discretion should be given to the quarter sessions, and that the full resources at the disposal of the local justices should be put at the disposal of the quarter sessions, so that they might deal with the fund in the most satisfactory and complete manner. In the hope that some Amendments of this kind would be adopted in Committee, he would support the Second Reading.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): Nearly every speaker who has taken part in this debate has commenced his speech by a denunciation of drunkenness, and an expression of his desire that there should be a reduction in the number of licences. On that point there is no difference of opinion. The object of this Bill is to diminish drunkenness, and to reduce the number of licensed houses, so far as it can be done consistently with public honesty and equity. There is no good in arguing with the people of extreme views on either side. If we wish to arrive at a satisfactory settlement of this question it must be by agreement among men of moderate views. The hon. Member for Camborne believes that all intoxicating liquor is poison, whether taken moderately or immoderately. We all respect his views and the great consistency with which he has advocated them; but it is no use arguing this matter with him, as he will not be convinced. Total prohibition is recognised by all reasonable men as being absolutely impracticable in this country. The sale of liquor is a necessity, and what we ought to do is to devote our energies to securing a more efficient control over that sale. The hon. Member for Oldham has said that the Bill ought to be received with suspicion because its authors, the Prime Minister and myself, seem sceptical as to whether the diminution of public-houses alone will reduce intemperance. What I have said is that I had some doubt as to whether a large reduction of licences, or even a large diminution in the consumption of alcoholic liquors, would lead to a corresponding reduction of intemperance. The Report of the

Royal Commission appeared to me to justify that view, because it is there stated that in some of the counties where there are fewest licences in proportion to population the greatest amount of drunkenness prevails.

MR. EMMOTT pointed out that in the counties referred to, wages, character of occupation, and conditions generally were different. In fact, it was a most jejune investigation of the question.

*MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS: At any rate, that is what the Commission pointed out, and it is a view held by a certain number of people in the country. What we desire to see is a general reduction in the number of licences. A reduction in the number of licences has been gradually going on in this country for some years. In 1903 there were about 6,000 fewer licences than there were in 1881. The hon. Member for Oldham has expressed doubt whether more rapid progress would be made under the Bill. The number of licences reducible if the Bill passes will be far greater than anything which has yet been accomplished. The hon. Gentleman doubted the sufficiency of the fund. I deprecate any arithmetic, certainly mental arithmetic, at a late hour in the evening in the House of Commons; but I may mention that some of the figures given in the pamphlet by Mr. Arthur Chamberlain have been corrected by the hon. Member for the Spen Valley, whilst in others, viz., the under-estimate of the sum available for compensation in Birmingham, I think Mr. Arthur Chamberlain's error is probably due to omitting from his calculation the number of beerhouses which have to be taken into account. At any rate, that number would bring the figures to very much the same as those given in the statement which has been laid before the House. I think too high an estimate has been taken in the debate of the compensation likely to be given for licences. But even at £1,000 per licence a million pounds would be sufficient to effect a reduction of 1,000 licences yearly, while if the average value of a licence is taken at £750, about 1,333 licences might be abolished, and if at £500, 2,000 licences might be abolished. That is a very considerable reduction compared with any which has taken place hitherto. In addition there would still be a certain number of licences which would be refused for misconduct and other causes, so that there may be a very considerable reduction over and above the number by which for the last twenty years the licences have been annually reduced. The Parliamentary Committee of the County Council in their report say that whereas the Government estimate the return in London County at £251,000 a year, it will really only amount to £190,000. An explanation of the discrepancy is probably to be found in connection with the beerhouses, and perhaps I may be excused for preferring the former figure; but, taking the latter and adopting the maximum ratio of public-houses to population recommended in the Minority Report of the Commission, the committee estimate the number of abolitions required in London at a figure for which the present Bill will more than suffice.

It has been contended by some hon. Members opposite that the number of licences would be more quickly reduced without the operation of this Bill.

That may possibly be so if the principle of confiscation is admitted and if the justices are to take away licences without any regard to the value of the licences or to the interest which has grown up in them and which, although not a legal right, by custom the law has allowed to go on. My right hon. friend the Member for Oxford University, speaking on the First Reading of the Bill, said that as chairman of quarter sessions he often felt very great difficulty in agreeing to the confiscation of a licence on the ground of the hardship such confiscation would inflict on the licensee. I think that if this Bill is passed any fear of that sort may be put aside; because under the new scheme if the licensing justices feel it their duty to take away the licence of a house where no misconduct has taken place, they will know that there will be compensation for the owner of the licence. A case came to my knowledge the other day of a man of eighty years of age who had held a house for forty years. He was assisted by a son in the management of some land attached to the house, and that son, being taken ill, died after an operation, the cost of which exhausted all their savings. No complaint has ever been made against the house, but, on the face of it, it was unnecessary in the district. The chairman of the brewster sessions said he thought it was to the interest of the district that the licence should be taken away, but he could not face the injustice which that course would inflict on this old man.

One point that has been pressed is the position of the publican as compared with that of the owner of the house in connection with the division of the compensation fund. It has always been the intention of the framers of the Bill that the publican should get his proper share of the compensation which would be given, should the licence of the house be taken away. We can surely trust in every way the quarter sessions to see that the publican gets his fair share; but, as we feel very strongly upon this point, if any words are necessary to make it perfectly clear, the Government will be prepared to consider them. There are cases in which his share will be small, but there are also cases in which it should be very large. The goodwill of the house and the trade done often depend very largely on the character and popularity of the licensee. There is the case of a professional cricketer who has come to a particular neighbourhood as the licensee of a public-house. Suppose he has conducted his house carefully and properly and after a certain number of years the house has to go in the public interest after he has brought great prosperity to the house. In such a case, in so far as the value to be assessed for compensation was increased, it would be only right and fair that he should have a very considerable share in the compensation money awarded to the licensee of that house. At all events, my hon. friend may rest assured that we have no intention whatever of allowing the occupant of the house, so far as we can provide for it in any way, to miss his share of the compensation.

My right hon. friend the Member for East Somersetshire has dealt very fairly with the question of the interference with the discretion of the licensing justices, and he, at all events, does not find that that interference is one of any very great importance. He realises that the brewster sessions will still deal with the whole of the cases of misconduct and that it is solely in the case where a licence is taken away through no fault of the owner that the question is referred to quarter sessions. In those cases, and in those only, is the final power transferred from the licensing justices. After all, as my right hon. friend has said, the change is not a great one. At the present time an appeal lies from the licensing justices to quarter sessions and the ultimate verdict is with them. In almost every case in which a licence is taken away solely on the ground that it is redundant, there is an appeal; and therefore it is with quarter sessions that the ultimate decision lies at present. Under the Bill local experience is retained, because brewster justices must take the initiative, and it is on their report alone that quarter sessions can act. We are told by hon. Members opposite that we are inflicting a severe snub upon a very worthy body of people in this country. For my own part I really cannot see that it is a greater snub for gentlemen to be obliged to refer their recommendations for decision to a body similar to that which ultimately decides the question now than it is to have their decisions reversed by quarter sessions, nor is a greater snub put upon the licensing justices by the Bill than there is upon a Court of the first instance when its decision is varied by a higher Court in this country. My right hon. friend the Member for East Somerset has suggested a time limit.

*MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE: No, what I said was that we might accept the time limit as a compromise. I preferred more discretion being left to quarter sessions.

*MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS: I am glad that I misunderstood my right hon. friend. I have always thought that a time limit is open to many objections. I do not quite know what hon. Members mean by it. I can quite understand a time limit, supposing the object of the Bill had been to restrain justices from exercising their powers. Then the licensed trade, within a period of ten or twelve years, could, by insurance or otherwise, have made their arrangements, knowing that after that time they would have no claim with regard to any vested or other interest. Supposing, again, that the compensation money was found by the State, I could see some *raison d'être* for a time limit. But with regard to this Bill it is practically out of the question. The Member for Oldham, although he would like to see it introduced, has admitted that it is entirely inconsistent with the principle of the Bill. Do they suppose that if a licensee knew that at the end of a given period his licence would be taken away he would be so careful either with regard to the condition of his premises or the way in which his business was conducted? Would not the tendency be to strain the law in order to make money while the sun shone? The imposition of a time limit would only mean that at the end of the period—whether it was seven years, or ten, or fifteen, or twenty—the present controversy would be revived, whereas the object of the Bill is to settle once for all the question by providing a method by which a gradual and ample reduction of licences can be carried out.

One or two other questions have been asked me during the debate. The hon. Member for Spen Valley asked about certain figures which were given upon the introduction of the Bill which appeared somewhat differently in the Bill itself. I pointed out to him that the explanation he gave of the alteration was incorrect, and I am prepared to give him now the reason why the scale has been slightly rearranged. This was done because on the one hand the figures were based in the first instance on a mere estimate as regards beerhouses, and required readjustment when more accurate statistics became available and, on the other, it was found that the new figures allowed, without reducing the sum aimed at, the reduction of the highest rate of charge, which would have borne unfairly on big hotels, more especially those hotels where only a small amount of liquor was consumed in comparison with this "unjust value." I shall be willing to give to the hon. Member full details on this point when the House goes into Committee on this Bill. Great stress has been laid upon the existence of so large a number of licences. But that is not the fault of the trade itself. The trade never desired to see a large number of licences, and it has been entirely owing to the action of Parliament in the past and to the free and easy way in which magistrates have granted licences that this difficulty has arisen. But there is no reason on that ground why the magistrates should not faithfully carry out the scheme proposed in the Bill for granting compensation, because they have to remember that a number of the licensed houses have been built on plans which they themselves have proposed, or embraced alterations which they themselves have insisted upon as a condition of granting the licence. It would be quite unreasonable that, in our desire to reduce the number of licences, we should take these licences away without giving reasonable and equitable compensation. The Government earnestly recommend the Bill to the favourable consideration of the House, in the confidence that the scheme of compensation it proposes is fair and reasonable, and in the belief that after a few years of the operation of the Act the present redundancy of licences will disappear.

Mr. ELLIS GRIFFITH (Anglesey) said the hon. Member opposite had informed them that this Bill had been drafted in the interests of the liquor trade and now the House knew something which no doubt the Prime Minister and the Home Secretary knew before. With regard to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Somersetshire, he had seldom heard a speech containing more arguments against the Bill coupled with the conclusion at the end of it that he was going to vote for the Second Reading. He told them that he was not voting for the Bill as it stood but as he hoped it would be when amended in Committee. He said that there were certain things which were essential to make it a good Bill which were not in the Bill now, and he declared himself against many of the clauses; in fact, he had spoken against si out of the nine clauses which the Bill contained. Perhaps that fact would discount to a great extent the vote which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Somersetshire was going to give upon the Second Reading of this Bill. In considering the principles which underlay this Bill there were as he understood it——

And, it being Midnight, the debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed to-morrow.

Adjourned at five minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 11th May, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

MR. SPEAKER'S INDISPOSITION.

The House being met, the Clerk at the Table informed the House of the unavoidable absence of Mr. SPEAKER, owing to the continuance of his indisposition.

Whereupon Mr. JAMES WILLIAM LOWTHER, the Chairman of Ways and Means, proceeded to the Table, and, after Prayers, took the Chair as Deputy Speaker, pursuant to the Standing Order.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Ebbw Vale Urban District Water Bill [Lords]; Manchester Ship Canal (Finance) Bill [Lords]. Read a second time, and committed.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill. Read a second time, and committed.

Carlisle Corporation Bill. Reported from the Police and Sanitary Committee, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions for alteration; from Largs; Weem; and Wick and Pulteneytown; to lie upon the Table.

HOUSE-LETTING (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Ayr, against; to lie upon the Table.

LICENCES (RENEWAL).

Petitions against alteration of Law; from Chelmsford; Goldenhill; Stoke on Trent; Bath; Market Rasen; Finchley Road; Liverpool; Lacock; Petersfield; Corsham; Pentonville; Wiltshire; North Shields (two); North East Kent; Faversham; Higher Broughton; Coed Poeth; Islington; Durham; Newfield; Tunstall; Keynsham; Brixton; Lincoln; New Seaham; Newbottle; Salford; Pelton Fell; North Durham; Salford Dock; Folkestone (two); Preston; Stratton St. Margarets; Swindon; Littlehampton; Manchester (five); Horncastle; North End Road; Smalley Common; Dewsbury; Gorse Hill; New Ferry; Fulham; Wandsworth Common; East Gwent; Aberdare (two); Moses Gate; Darlington (twenty-one); North Devon; Patricroft; Penzance; Urmston; Farnworth; Stockport (two); Hove; Wroxall; Scarborough; Trafford Park; Thornton Heath; Tiverton; Walham Green; Lower Wortley; Hebburn; Swindon (five); Stockton on Tees; Thornaby; Hartlepool; Retford; Poplar; Bideford; Clenchwarton; Tilehurst; Pangbourne; Dearham; Harrington; Cheetwood; Aspatria; Kirkbride; Nuneaton; Cheetham Hill; Hillsborough; Worcester; Bradford; Gloucester; Aston; Campbeltown; Middlesbrough (two); and North Ormesby; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions against; from Derby (nine); Knaresborough; Tynemouth; Percy Main; North Shields (two); Metropolitan Tabernacle; Spalding; London (two); Hastings; Derbyshire; Wheatley Hill; Thornley; Guisbrough (two); Upper Parkstone; Dorset; Tunbridge Wells (four); Higher Broughton; Skelton; Brymbo (eight); Ponkey; Coed Poeth; Sleaford (five); Market Rasen; Louth (seven); Shepherds Bush (two); Gresham; Sunderland (three); Elgin; Rawtenstall; Waterbarn; Lumb; Birmingham: Harrogate (ten); Shildon; Bishop Auckland (two); New Shildon; Newcastle under Lyme (three); Cranbrook; Heywood; Highworth (four); Kellah; Busby; Normanton (two); Lincoln; Earlsfield; New Silksworth; Muirkirk (two); Ryhope Colliery; Salford; Upper Tooting; Tooting; Southfields; Swalwell; Garesfield; Ouston; New Washington; Chopwell; Blaydon; Clara Vale; Durham three); Dawley; Wrenthorpe; Attercliffe (two); Poplar; Brockley; Bargoed; Porth (four); Pentyrch; Denny; Sheffield (two); Redcar; Brighton (three); South Shields; Haydon Bridge; Hexham on Tyne; Acomb; Henshaw; Corbridge;

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

Hexham; Bardon Mill; Halton le Gate (two); Crewe (two); Ilkeston; Rusholme; Manchester (six); Fulham (four); Mid Annandale; Baillieston; Batley (three); Glasgow (five); Malton; Thirsk (two); Hoylake; New Ferry; Wallasey; Orkney; Melton Mowbray (two); Great Berkhamstead; Rickmansworth; Ashton under Lyne; Chipperfield; Ripon (two); Carlin How; Hutton Rudby; Norwich (two); Yorkshire; Ryhill; Barnsley; Falkirk (three); Lanark; Fence Houses (two); Stockwell; Westmorland; Selly Oak; Farnworth (seven); Huntingdon; Caerphilly; Senghenydd; Cilfynydd (two); Senghenith; Efailisaf; Abertridwr; Havod; Deri; Cadoxton; Rhydfelen; Treforest; Taffs Well; Rudry; Blaenlleshan; Cardiff (twenty); Darlington; Longtown; Brixton; Dolton; Cheriton Fitzpaine; Northampton (five); Penzance; Carfury Gulval; Swinton (ten); Pendlebury (four); Worsley; Irlams o' th' Height; Chorley; Llandudno; Brixham; Torquay; Belfast (two); Overleigh; St. Helens; Gaywood; King's Lynn; Barnes (two); Pensarn; Tavistock; Coalville (two); Stockport (five); Chesham; Clipstone; Nelson; Dronfield; Larbert West; Bridgnorth; Maidstone (four); Wanstead; Morley; Coventry; Camberwell (two); Fleet; Hindley Green; Woodburn; Allenheads; Wedmore; Highbridge; Yalding; Fleetwood; Bradford on Avon; Chelmsford; Street; Walton; Wiveliscombe; Minehead; Machynlleth; Heytesbury; Manvers Street; Bath (three); Lowmour; Clayton; Wibsey; Stratford (two); Calne; Wilts; Corsham (two); Church Gastard; Petersfield; Kendal; Chippenham; Darwen; Cambridge; Brighouse; Blyth (four); Levenshulme; Dukinfield; Woodside; South Norwood (two); Laisterdyke; West Bowling; Bradford (ten); Liverpool; Bedlington (two); Thinford; Croxdale Colliery; Hamsteels; Broompark; Lewes (two); Oxford; Grimsby; Stockton-on-Tees (two); West Retford; Greenock (eleven); Leighton Buzzard (two); Luton (two); Chyangweal Lelant; Evans Town; Ross; Avoch; Temperance Advocates' Union; Anderston; Llantrisant (two); Horsham; Temperance Committee of the Congregational Union of Scotland; Rushden; East Northamptonshire; Wellingborough; Worstead; Port Glasgow; Thornton; Hanwell; Loughborough; Reading; Newbury (two); Brampton Junction; Taunton; Westminster; King's Sutton; Kilmarnock; Craven; Wood Green; Hull; Rochdale (two); Kingston-upon-Hull; Hirwain; Aberdare; Merthyr Tydfil (four); Abercanaid; East Glamorgan; East Kirkby; Dumbarton; Felling on Tyne (two); South Bank (three); Middlesbrough (six); Vale of Alford; Auchterarder; Galston; Ayrshire; Mary Hammond and others; Shettleston; Ayr (two); Evesham; Frizinghall; Aston Manor; Pollokshields; Lugar; Busby; Dennyloanhead; Aberdeen; Lochee; Dundee (eight) North-West Yorkshire; and Scarborough; to lie upon the Table.

VALUATION BILL.

Petition from Dewsbury, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

NEW ZEALAND.

Copy presented, of Correspondence relating to The Preferential and Reciprocal Trade Act, 1903 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PRISONS (SCOTLAND)

Copy presented, of Rule made by the Secretary for Scotland as to the Constitution of the Visiting Committee to Inverness Prison [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 167.]

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3157 and 3158 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

EAST INDIA (INCOME AND EXPENDITURE).

Return presented, relative thereto [Address 10th March; *Sir Henry Fowler*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 168.]

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

Inquiry into Charities (County of Lancaster). Further Return relative thereto [ordered 8th August, 1898; *Mr. Grant Lawson*]; to be printed. [No. 169.]

COUNTY COURTS (IRELAND), REGISTRARS (SALARIES, ETC.).

Return ordered, "showing the Salaries and Fees paid to each of the Registrars of County Court Judges in Ireland for the year 1903."—(*Mr. Condon.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Education Act—Children and Religious Instruction.

MR. ROSE (Cambridgeshire, Newmarket): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether the head-master of a school is empowered to keep in school during the usual play time a child whose parents have declined to pay the Education Rate and who do not send the child to school until a quarter to ten.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) The refusal of a parent to pay the Education Rate is clearly not an infraction of school discipline on the part of the child, and would not justify the detention of the child during play-time. Whether not sending a child to school till a quarter to ten constitutes such an infraction would depend on the authorised time-table of the school and the by-laws in force in the area.

MR. ROSE: To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether the education committee of a county council have power to issue an order that all children are to be at school every morning at a quarter to nine; and, if the parents of a child object to the dogmas of the Church of England, to compel the child to sit on a side form and do other work, where all that is taught can be heard by him.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) The hour at which a school opens is decided by the local authority, or by the managers, subject to the approval of that authority, and must be entered on the time-table, which is open to the inspection of parents. Under the ordinary form of by-law a child must attend the school during the whole time for which the school is open. If the parent desires the child to be withdrawn from religious instruction it is the duty of the local authority to make such arrangements for the withdrawal of the child and for giving him other instruction, as the school premises permit. Under a different form of by-law occasionally adopted by local authorities, either generally or in particular parts of their own area, it is possible under certain circumstances for a child to be withdrawn by his parent from the premises of the school, and not merely from the religious instruction, during the period referred to.

Suggested Increased Pension for John Lawlor.

MR. JOYCE (Limerick): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if his attention has been called to the case of Naval Pensioner John Lawlor, O.F. No. 1074, who has served in the Crimea, India, and China on board the "Sanspareil," and when paid off spent twenty years in the Royal Naval Reserve, and has 1s. per day; and, if so, whether, in view of this man's age and circumstances, the Lords of the Admiralty can grant him a small increase in his pension.

(*Answered by Mr. Pretyman.*) The man referred to had under four years service in the Navy. He received a pension of 1s. a day in 1883; in the year 1899 it was continued for life. Since that date no application for any increase has been received from him. In view of his age, however, the question of increasing his present pension from the special funds of Greenwich Hospital to 1s. 3d. a day, the maximum provided under the regulations for men of his class, is now under the consideration of the Admiralty.

Magillan Camp Post Office.

MR. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): To ask the Postmaster-General whether a telegraph office is to be opened at Magillan Camp on the 16th instant; and whether he will see that, if opened, it will be worked by a man permanently attached to the Derry staff, as in previous years.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) A post office will be provided at Magillan Camp on the 16th instant, but no arrangements have been made to open a telegraph office, and there has been no such office in previous years.

Parcel Rates to Egypt, Japan, etc.

MR. TOULMIN (Bury, Lancashire): To ask the Postmaster-General if his attention has been called to the greater rate of postage for parcels charged from the United Kingdom than from various European countries to Egypt, Japan, and many of our Colonies; and if he is prepared to revise the rates so that our commerce shall not be at a disadvantage owing to the more costly nature of parcel post facilities from the United Kingdom.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) No opportunity of reducing the rates on parcels sent from this country to places abroad is neglected, and negotiations for a reduction of the rates to Japan are now in progress. The question of a reduction is, however, not one which rests solely or even primarily within my discretion, as the rates on such parcels are, roughly, the aggregate of the amounts required by the several administrations through whose hands the parcels have to pass.

Male Learners in Londonderry Post Office.

MR. WOOD (Down, E.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that there are at the present time five male learners at Londonderry Post Office fully qualified with no present prospect of appointment; and whether it is contemplated to take steps to provide situations for them and to discontinue the introduction of additional learners until the existing ones secure permanent employment.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) There are at present six male learners employed at Londonderry; they are all qualified for appointment but only two of them have served for as long as twelve months at that office. Learners are admitted on the understanding that vacancies on the established class of sorting clerks and telegraphists occur at irregular intervals, and that no assurance can be given as to the time within which an established appointment will be obtained; they are given full-time employment as substitute sorting clerks and telegraphists whenever practicable. The question of reducing the number of learners at Londonderry is at present under consideration.

Alterations in Londonderry Post Office.

MR. WOOD: To ask the Postmaster-General whether he can give the date on which the proposed alterations in the Londonderry Post Office are to be commenced; and whether, in view of the amount of accommodation for the staff, he will give instructions to hasten the improvements.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) I am not at present able to give the date on which the proposed alterations will be commenced, but I will see that there is no avoidable delay in the matter.

The Athanasian Creed.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton): To ask Mr. Attorney-General whether his attention has been called to certain resolutions passed by the Southern and Northern Convocations of the Church of England in regard to changes in the Athanasian Creed; and whether, in view of the fact that no changes can be made in that Creed without an Act of Parliament, it is contemplated by His Majesty's Government to bring in a Bill during the present Parliament to legalise any changes in that Creed which may be recommended by the said Church, or one putting an end to its connection with the State, in order to leave to it full freedom of action in this and similar matters.

(*Answered by Sir Robert Finlay.*) There is no intention on the part of His Majesty's Government to introduce a Bill for either of the purposes mentioned in the Question.

Return of Indebtedness of Borough Councils.

MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): To ask the President of the Local Government Board when the Return of indebtedness of borough councils, ordered 24th June, 1903, may be expected to be in the hands of Members.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) I hope it will be in the hands of Members this week.

Regulations for Heavy Motor Vehicles.

MR. TOULMIN: To ask the President of the Local Government Board if the regulations for heavy motor vehicles may be expected at an early date, seeing that the Departmental Committee has now reported and in view of the effect of delay on the business of the manufacturers of such vehicles.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) The precise regulations to be made require some consideration, but I am giving attention to the subject with a view to their being issued as early as practicable.

Arsenical Poisoning—Adoption of Recommendations of Royal Commission.

SIR CUTHBERT QUILTER (Suffolk, Sudbury): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether the conference between representatives of the Government Departments concerned has yet taken place, and whether he is in a position to announce what course he proposes to adopt to give effect to the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Arsenical Poisoning, more especially for the protection of the public against the use of injurious ingredients in beer and the fixing of a standard of purity.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) Some preliminary questions have had to be considered before any conference could take place. These are now receiving my attention, and I hope to arrive at a decision upon them very shortly.

Census of 1901 for Scotland and Ireland.

MR. TOULMIN: To ask the President of the Board of Trade if the figures for the Census of 1901 are now available for Scotland and Ireland to complete the Summary Table of Persons engaged in Certain Groups of Industries, given on page 362 of Cd. 1761 of 1903; and if he will give such summary for Scotland and Ireland.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) The 1901 Census figures of the occupations of the people in Scotland and Ireland are now available. A statement will be compiled on the same lines as in the table referred to in the Question so far as practicable.

Taxes—Cost of Collection.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer can he state approximately the cost per cent. of collecting the net revenue derived in 1903–4 from Customs, Excise, Estate Duties, Stamps, Land Tax and House Duty, Property and Income-tax, Post Office, Telegraph Service, and Crown Lands respectively, including and distinguishing in each case such indirect costs of collection as are properly to be included in the cost of collection, such as a due share of the cost of the Coastguard and Preventive Service in the case of Customs Duties.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) It is not possible to allocate between the separate heads of revenue under one department the cost per cent. of their collection, but only to give the cost per cent. for each department as a whole. The figures for the Charges of Collection in the case of Customs, Inland Revenue, and Post Office are given in the Annual Return, entitled "Taxes and Imports," the latest of which is H.C., No. 303, of 1903. The exact figures for 1903–4 are not yet available. Approximately, however, it may be stated that the percentage cost of collection for the services in question was as follows:—Customs—2·62 per cent. on the gross amount of duties collected. Inland Revenue—2·24 per cent. on the gross amount of duties collected for 1902–3, the latest figures available. Post Office—percentage of total expenditure to total revenue 71·11 per cent.; Telegraph Service—percentage of total expenditure to total revenue 122·89 per cent.; together 81·21 per cent.; Crown Lands—7·5 per cent. It is not possible to ascertain or include such a charge as "a due share of the cost of the Coastguard and Preventive Service in the case of Customs Duties," but it is considered in that case that such indirect costs are counterbalanced by the services rendered gratuitously by the Customs Department to other departments. For details as to Inland Revenue, Postal and Telegraph Collections, the hon. Member is referred to page 17 of the Report of the Commissioners of Inland Revenue for 1903 [Cd. 1717], and Appendices Q. and R. of the Postmaster-General's Report for 1903 [Cd. 1705].

National Bank of Ireland and the Receivable Order from under the Land Purchase Act.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Wexford, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he has received any communication from the National Bank with regard to the form of the proposed Receivable Order under the Land Purchase Act of 1903; and if he will agree to the suggestion made by that bank.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) Yes, Sir, I have received a communication from the National Bank suggesting an alteration in the note which appears on the face of the new form of Receivable Order. The words, which it is suggested should be omitted from the note, were inserted to prevent the delays in accounting that arise from direct remittance being made to the office of the Land Commission instead of to the bank, and to facilitate payers of annuities who prefer to utilise the post for the remittance of cheques or postal orders for payment with the Receivable Order to the Bank of Ireland, instead of having to walk or drive to the nearest bank to lodge the money. I am of opinion that the words in question should be retained.

Sick Pay and Compensation for Accidents at Royal Army Clothing Factory (Engineers Department).

MR. SHACKLETON (Lancashire, Clitheroe): To ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state what rules the men employed by the engineers department at the Royal Army Clothing Department are working under in regard to sick pay and compensation for accidents.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) The hon. Member is presumably alluding to the permanent engineers of the Royal Army Clothing Department. These men receive sick and injury pay under the "Regulations for time workers" in the Royal Army Clothing Department, Sections 35 to 53. When on the sick list they receive:—If serving on 31st July, 1900, and continuously since, full pay for two months. Otherwise, half pay for three months. Both classes receive extensions under certain conditions. When injured they are treated in accordance with the provisions of The Workmen's Compensation Act, 1897, or a scheme of compensation made thereunder which has been certified by the Registrar of Friendly Societies. Under the scheme, when on the injury list, those serving on 31st July, 1900, and continuously since, receive full pay for three months, with extensions, if necessary, of three-fourths pay for three months and half-pay for any further period for which sick pay may be granted; those who entered since 31st July, 1900, receive half-pay up to a limit of six months.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Native Labour on the Rand Mines—Cape of Good Hope Blue-book.

MAJOR SEELY (Isle of Wight): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can state when the Blue-book, Cape of Good Hope, G 4, 1904, containing the report of the delegates appointed by the Government of Cape Colony to inquire into the conditions of Native labour on the Rand Mines, was received at the Colonial Office; and when it is proposed to lay it upon the Table.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. LYTTELTON, Warwick and Leamington): The Cape Blue-book referred to was received in the Colonial Office on 28th March. I had previously received a copy of the report from Lord Milner on 25th January. It is included in the Papers laid upon the Table on Friday last, which will be in the hands of Members on Friday or Saturday.

Report on Health of Natives employed on the Rand Mines.

MAJOR SEELY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been drawn to the Report for the year 1903 furnished to the Witwatersrand Native Labour Association by the general manager of that association concerning the health of natives employed on the Rand Mines, showing a mortality of 79·8 per 1,000 amongst those natives, together with suggestions as to improvements of the conditions under which they work; and whether he will lay this document upon the Table.

MR. LYTTELTON: I have not yet been supplied by Lord Milner with this Report which, I believe, has not been published, and I am not therefore in a position to lay it on the Table, but I will inquire.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar): Does the right hon. Gentleman mean that the Report will be laid on the Table as soon as he receives it?

MR. LYTTELTON: I will consider that.

SIR JOHN GORST (Cambridge University): When will the special Report on the mortality among the 1,000 natives who were experimentally imported from Central Africa be laid on the Table? And is it a fact that of those 1,000 natives no less than 380 died?

MR. LYTTELTON: The Report has been already laid.

MAJOR SEELY: May I ask if I am correctly informed that the particular Report to which I have referred in my Question has been supplied to the Government of the Transvaal, and must therefore be available. The Paper shows nothing to the discredit of those who had charge of the natives, and I should like to know whether the right hon. Gentleman will give some promise that if it is a State Paper it shall be laid.

MR. LYTTELTON: If it is a State Paper I shall certainly be prepared to lay it. But I have not yet seen it.

Native Mortality in the Rand Mines.

MAJOR SEELY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can state the total number of deaths which occurred in the year 1903 amongst the natives employed on the Rand Mines.

MR. LYTTELTON: I am afraid I cannot give an answer to that Question with absolute precision. I think my hon. and gallant friend and I were at cross purposes the other night with regard to some figures that were quoted. As far as I can surmise, I think my hon. and gallant friend was quoting one period and one area, while I was quoting another. As far as I can ascertain, the present situation is that in the earlier months of 1903 and the end of 1902 the average rate of mortality was 57 per 1,000. I am not speaking with absolute precision, but taking the whole of 1903 and the present year up to April, the figure rose to 66 per 1,000. My hon. and gallant friend mentioned a figure of 90 per 1,000; that I am not able to follow, I expect, because we have been referring to different periods.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: Will the right hon. Gentleman draw up some Return and lay it on the Table, to show the basis on which his figures as to those in employment were based, and also as to the proportion of mortality among those employed.

MR. LYTTELTON: That is a perfectly legitimate demand, with which I will certainly comply.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL (Yorkshire, Cleveland): May I ask whether the right hon. Gentleman is unable to answer the Question which the hon. Member for the Isle of Wight has asked, namely, what was the actual number of natives who died on the Rand Mines in 1903—not per 1,000, but the total number.

MR. LYTTELTON: I cannot do that absolutely, because the figures have got confused owing to the number being taken of the labourers employed in mining operations throughout the Transvaal and not specifically on the Rand. I will inquire.

Cape Colony Legislative Assembly—Resolution against Chinese Labour.

MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether a Resolution condemning the introduction of Chinese indentured labourers into South Africa has been quite recently unanimously passed by the Legislative Assembly of Cape Colony; and, in that case, will he give its terms and the date when it was adopted.

MR. LYTTELTON: I understand that the terms of the Resolution are as follows:—This House, taking cognisance, as it does with regret, that measures are being taken for the importation of Asiatic labour into South Africa, now re-affirms the opinion it expressed in the Resolution adopted unanimously on the 2nd July, 1903, and re-asserts its strong opposition to any such importation as prejudicial to the interests of all classes of the people of South Africa.

Mr. BAYLEY (Derbyshire, Chesterfield): Was not the Resolution passed unanimously?

Mr. LYTTELTON: Without a division.

Transvaal Magistracy.

Mr. JOHN ELLIS: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies when he proposes to present the promised Return giving the names, ages, salaries, qualifications, experience, and previous careers of the persons holding the post of magistrates in the Transvaal.

Mr. LYTTELTON: I have not yet received the required information from the Governor, but I will again call his attention to the matter.

Tibetan Mission—Communications with Russia.

Mr. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether any communications regarding the Expedition, or "Mission," now in Tibet have passed between His Majesty's Government and the Russian Government since 17th November, 1903; and, if so, what has been the nature or purport of those communications; and when the Papers containing them will be presented to Parliament.

*The UNDER-SECRETARY of STATE for FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Earl Percy, Kensington, S.): Such communications as have passed between the representatives of the two Governments have been of an informal and private character, and there are at present no Papers which could be laid upon the Table.

Protection of British Interests at Newchwang.

Mr. CHARLES McARTHUR (Liverpool, Exchange): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the British Consul at Newchwang has requested the despatch of a gunboat to that port for the protection of British interests, in view of the danger of pillage by brigands upon or immediately subsequent to the reported Russian retirement; and can he say what steps are being taken for the safeguarding of British life and property in the contingency mentioned.

*Earl PERCY: The answer to the first Question is in the negative. Newchwang being in the theatre of war, His Majesty's Government took some time ago the only course open to them by addressing representations to the belligerents requesting them to take such measures as circumstances might permit to safeguard the interests of British subjects at Newchwang. A reply was received from the Russian Government stating that all precautions would be taken for the protection of the lives and property of British subjects.

Mr. CHARLES McARTHUR: May I ask what will be the position of British subjects and property if there is an interval between the retirement of the Russians and the coming of the Japanese, supposing brigands arrive? Who would be responsible for the protection of British lives and property?

*Earl PERCY: In the event of such an interval occurring, of course no protection could be afforded by the belligerents.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis) asked would it not be the case that Newchwang would revert to its own proper Sovereign, the Chinese Government, and would not they be responsible.

Earl PERCY: I am not aware that there are any Chinese troops in the place.

Congo Free State.

Mr. CHARLES DOUGLAS (Lanarkshire, N.W.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether His Majesty's Government have received replies to the communications sent last year to the signatories of the Berlin Act respecting administration in the Congo Free State; and when those replies will be laid upon the Table of the House.

*Earl PERCY: The answer is in the negative.

Bovine Tuberculosis—Report of the Royal Commission.

Mr. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he can state when the Report of the Royal Commission on Bovine Tuberculosis is likely to be issued; whether he can arrange that it will be available for the use of the Select Committee to whom the Tuberculosis (Animals) Compensation Bill has been referred; and whether he can state when that Committee will be appointed.

The SECRETARY to the LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. Grant Lawson, Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk): I believe that the Royal Commission on Tuberculosis do not expect to be able to make their final Report for a considerable time, but I understand that they now propose to make an interim Report which they trust will be issued before Whitsuntide. It will thus be available for the use of the Select Committee referred to in the Question. That Committee will, I hope, be appointed this week.

Small Farmers in Ireland and the Housing Problem.

Mr. SHEEHAN (Cork County, Mid.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has given any consideration to the claims of small farmers of £4 valuation and under for better housing accommodation; has he caused any inquiries to be instituted into the manner in which they are at present housed; and does he propose to do anything in the Labourers (Ireland) Bill to afford means and opportunities to this class to provide themselves with better dwellings.

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Mr. Wyndham, Dover): It is not proposed in the Labourers Bill to charge the rates, or to advance money from public funds, for the benefit of small farmers.

Irish Police and Bands.

Mr. HAYDEN (Roscommon, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Sergeant Frizelle, of Frenchpark, county Roscommon, on Saturday evening last prevented a local band from practising on the public road, and threatened that in the event of their doing so he would not allow them to practice in future; and, if so, will be state whether the sergeant has any power to enable him to adopt such a course.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The sergeant had reason to believe that the object of the band on this particular occasion was to promote an unlawful demonstration in respect of a farm which adjoins the public road. In this belief the sergeant remonstrated in a friendly manner with the bandsmen and they at once desisted. In reply to the second part of the Question, no hard and fast rule can be laid down; every case must be considered on its own merits and having regard to the circumstances of the moment.

Mr. HAYDEN asked by what authority the sergeant acted in this manner.

Mr. WYNDHAM replied that some one must be the judge as to the steps to be taken to prevent a breach of the peace. It was a difficult duty to discharge and he understood that in this case the band made no demur.

Mr. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): But the charge is that the sergeant threatened to break the big drum unless his orders were obeyed? Why should he be allowed to act in that manner?

Mr. WYNDHAM: My information is that he remonstrated in a friendly way.

Mr. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): Are we to understand that in future sergeants in the Royal Irish Constabulary are to be the sole judges whether or not a band shall be allowed to play in public?

Mr. WYNDHAM: That is not the question at all.

Mr. FLAVIN: It is.

Mr. BLAKE (Longford, S.): Would it be remonstrating in a friendly manner to break the big drum?

[No answer was returned.]

Royal Irish Constabulary and the Irish Guards.

Mr. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state if prior to or since the establishment of the Irish Guards any inducements were offered to members of the Royal Irish Constabulary to enlist in that regiment; and, if so, with that result.

Mr. WYNDHAM: No such inducements have been held out to members of the Royal Irish Constabulary.

Banbridge Disturbances.

Mr. MACVEAGH: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that an Orange drumming party were allowed to assemble in Banbridge, county Down, on Thursday, with the object of preventing an Irish concert in the local town hall; that District Inspector Bell allowed the mob to demonstrate in front of the town hall and made no effort to disperse the party; and that the houses of Nationalist traders and citizens were subsequently attacked by them; and, if so, will he say whether any of the rioters will be prosecuted.

Mr. WYNDHAM: It is a common practice in Banbridge for Orange drumming parties to march through the streets and assemble on Downshire Bridge, which is in the vicinity of the town hall. They so assembled on two occasions on the evening in question, namely, at 9.30 and 10 o'clock. The crowd accompanying the band cheered on both occasions, but there was nothing riotous in their conduct. It is quite possible that this may have been intended as a counter-demonstration to the concert in the town hall, but the concert does not appear to have been interrupted or disturbed, nor did any collision take place. One stone appears to have been thrown, breaking a window in the town hall, and next day a pane of glass was found to have been broken in the house of a Roman Catholic in Scarva Street. No complaint of any other offences have reached the police. The police cannot identify the persons who threw these stones, nor did they see anything which would have justified them in dispersing the crowd, even if a sufficient force was available, which was not the case. The force has since been augmented by three constables and a sergeant.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): In reply to another Question just now the right hon. Gentleman said the police stopped a band playing because they thought it might lead to trouble. In this case the police took no such action, and it led to trouble and rioting and an attack on certain houses. Can the right hon. Gentleman say what is to be the practice of the police in this matter, North, South, and West?

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): Has it not been brought under the right hon. Gentleman's notice that at Bangor, county Down, and at Dromore, land meetings were interrupted by bands playing before the place of meeting, which made it impossible to hear the speakers, and that at Dromore a disturbance resulted?

Mr. SEYMOUR ORMSBY-GORE (Lincolnshire, Gainsborough): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that there was no intention on the part of the Orange band to disturb the meeting?

Mr. WYNDHAM: I think the supplemental Questions which have been addressed to me show how difficult it is for a person acting on his own responsibility in Ireland to decide whether he should interfere or not. There was no interference in this case because the police had no evidence of who threw the stones, but the force there has now been augmented. In the other case the sergeant remonstrated in a friendly way.

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL: I got my head broken in a friendly way.

Mr. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): Is it not a fact that at the concert which took place on Friday, the 6th, the persons who took part in it entered the gardens of residents and threw flowers all over the place?

MR. WYNDHAM: I have no information.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Will the right hon. Gentleman inquire how it is that the police interfered in the case in Roscommon where the band was walking along the road, because they said there was fear of trouble, and did not take similar action in the North of Ireland, although repeatedly such occurrences have led to rioting, as at Lisburn.

MR. WYNDHAM: We cannot now have a debate on the action of the police in Ireland, but in the case of Lisburn the police interfered and received injuries themselves. In the case in Roscommon the policeman interfered and his suggestion was taken in a friendly way. In the other case the police did not interfere, and even if they had wished to do so they were not in sufficient force. I have since ordered the force to be increased there.

Arms Act in Ireland—Case of Martin Jennings.

MR. ROCHE (Galway, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that on the 6th March last a gun belonging to Mr. Martin Jennings, of Killamonagh, Caherlestrane, county Galway, was seized by the police sergeant; and, if so, whether, seeing that Jennings had both a magistrate's and Excise licence, he will state if the gun has been returned, and, if not, will he explain why.

MR. WYNDHAM: The licence extends only to the farm of Mr. Jennings. He was found using the weapon outside this area and it was seized and became forfeited. If he makes formal application to the Lord-Lieutenant it will be restored to him.

Irish Constable and Galway Temperance Society.

MR. ROCHE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a policeman, named Scully, stationed at Monivea, county Galway, has obtained membership of a temperance society there in opposition to the wishes of the majority of the members; and, if so, whether, seeing that this man has been frequently reported for drunkenness and that other complaints have been recently made to his superior officer, he will direct, under the circumstances, that Scully withdraws from the society.

MR. WYNDHAM: The constable was reduced from the rank of acting sergeant in July last for drunkenness. Subsequently he joined the temperance society. The district inspector states he was in no way to blame in connection with the complaints recently made against him. The authorities have no power to call upon him to withdraw from the temperance society, nor can I suppose that anyone would wish to put impediments in the way of the constable's efforts to avoid the temptation of drink.

MR. ROCHE: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that several members of this society have resigned because of this man joining the society? Will he not direct him to withdraw from it?

MR. WYNDHAM: Each person must be judge of his own action in a case of this kind.

Irish Assistant Teachers.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state whether the reduction of the average for first assistant teachers from sixty to fifty dates from the 1st April last.

MR. WYNDHAM; No provision has yet been made by Parliament for effecting this reduction, and until this has been done it cannot be stated from what date it will take effect. The matter is one for consideration in connection with the Development Grant Estimate.

In reply to a further Question Mr. WYNDHAM said he would be in a position to give fuller information to-morrow in reply to the Question of which the hon. Member for Waterford had given notice.

Piers in the Dingle Union.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that applications for improving piers at Ballydavid, Smerwick, and Brandon Creek (Dingle Union) have been made; and that the fishermen using those piers suffer loss owing to want of proper piers; and whether, seeing that those people are dependent almost entirely on fishing, he will direct the Congested Districts Board to send down an inspector to report on the need for larger piers at those places.

Mr. WYNDHAM: An application was recently received from the district council in respect of the pier at Ballydavid. Before further considering the application, the Congested Districts Board inquired what action had been taken by the council on the offer made by the Board in February, 1900, with respect to the slip at Smerwick. The council has not yet replied to this inquiry. The Board voted £66 for improving the landing place at Brandon Creek in November last, but inasmuch as labour could not be obtained in the locality at the usual rate of wages the work has been postponed for the present.

Kingston Estate, County Cork.

Mr. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Cork County, N.E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that negotiations have for some time been pending for the sale to the tenants of the Kingston Estate, county Cork, as a whole; that, on receipt of a counter proposal made by the tenants to the terms offered by the landlord, notices were served on them for immediate payment of a year's rent unless the landlord's terms were accepted, and as this action did not achieve its object, an application was made to the Estates Commissioners to approve the creation of a separate estate consisting of four townlands; and if he will consider the desirability of representing to the Estates Commissioners the necessity of instituting an inquiry into the circumstances of the matter before giving their sanction to these proceedings.

Mr. WYNDHAM: I understand that the terms for sale of this property were originally proposed by a deputation of the tenants and accepted by the landlord. Subsequently the tenants repudiated the terms and made fresh proposals. The negotiations have been reopened, however, and in only one case has a tenant been served with a notice requiring him to pay a year's rent. The matter has not yet been brought before the Estates Commissioners.

Mr. LUNDON (Limerick, E.): Arising out of the right hon. Gentleman's reply, I beg to ask him is he aware that through the influence of Mr. Frend, the agent, the tenants on the Kildorrery side of the property are arranging to purchase at twenty-six years purchase in a certain number of cases; and does he think those tenants will afterwards be able to pay back their dividends; and is he aware that in the next constituency, which I have the honour to represent, sales are taking places at various prices from eighteen to twenty years purchase.

Mr. WYNDHAM replied that he could not enter into the matter now.

Captain DONELAN (Cork County, E.): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that similar attempts have been made by many landlords in the south of Ireland with a view of extorting impossible prices from their tenants.

Mr. WYNDHAM: I am not aware of that.

Mr. MURPHY was understood to ask if the right hon. Gentleman would see that the Estates Commissioners, when a landlord wished to sell, endeavoured to have the estate split up properly.

Mr. WYNDHAM: I have every confidence in the Estates Commissioners.

Death of Michael Curtin in Cork Gaol.

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY (Limerick, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware of the finding of the Coroner's jury in the city of Cork, at the inquest held on the death of Michael Curtin, of Mountcollins, in the county of Limerick, who died in Cork Prison infirmary on the 14th January, 1903, in which they censured the resident magistrate, W. Flanagan, in refusing, when offered, bail to the deceased, his mother, and brother, who were charged at Abbeyfeale Petty

Sessions with taking forcible possession of a dwelling-house vacant at the time and from which they were previously evicted, and sent forward by him for trial to the Cork Assizes; and whether, seeing that the other defendants were discharged by the Lord Chief Justice at the Assizes, and having regard to these facts, will he institute an inquiry into the conduct of this resident magistrate.

MR. WYNDHAM: Michael Curtin died in Cork Prison on the 14th December, 1903. The Coroner's jury returned a verdict to the effect that the cause of death was appendicitis. The verdict contained no censure on the resident magistrate. Curtin was admitted to the Cork Prison on the 27th November for trial at the Winter Assizes, and on the 1st December the Crown entered a *nolle prosequi* against him. He was too ill, however, to be discharged from prison or to be removed to the local hospital. He received every care and attention in the interval before his death from the prison doctor and a local doctor, in consultation, and two trained nurses were employed to attend on him. The resident magistrate refused to admit the prisoner to bail in the exercise of his discretion, which was subject to review in the King's Bench Division of the High Court. It is not competent to the Executive to question the judicial action of the resident magistrate or to institute the inquiry suggested.

MR. SHEEHAN: Is it not the fact that this man was refused bail and died in gaol while awaiting trial?

MR. WYNDHAM: That is all contained in my answer.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will favourably consider the application of Margaret Curtin, for compensation owing to the loss of her son Michael Curtin, who died in Cork Prison infirmary, previous to his trial at the Cork Assizes, on the 14th January, 1903, who was charged with taking forcible possession of a house from which he and his family were evicted, having regard to the fact that this woman is fifty-three years of age and in humble circumstances.

MR. WYNDHAM: The death of any man whilst awaiting trial and consequent loss to his relatives may naturally excite private sympathy. But, obviously, it is not possible for the Government to intervene.

Pallaskenry—Offensive Public Notice.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state whether he intends to take any steps in the public interest to remove a notice offensive to Roman Catholics, which is hung daily from ten o'clock a.m. to seven o'clock p.m. on a notice board on the walls of a house in the public street in the village of Pallaskenry, in the county of Limerick.

MR. WYNDHAM: I do not think I can usefully supplement my reply to the hon. Member's Question of Monday on this subject.†

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY: By whose authority is it done?

MR. WYNDHAM: The hon. Member does not seem to understand the extent of the liberty of the subject in this country.

MR. JOYCE (Limerick): If notices are offensive to the general public, should not the local authority see that they are withdrawn?

MR. WYNDHAM: I do not see how the local authority could usefully intervene in a question of taste.

MR. LUNDON: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that for better than forty years this system of abusing members of the Catholic Church has been persistently carried on by the landlord there at the present time, and formerly by his father, Parson Waller, who was notoriously a proselytising minister?

[No answer was returned.]

---

† See Page 770.

Railway Rates in Ireland.

MR. MACVEAGH: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the appointment by the Board of Agriculture of a Departmental Committee of Inquiry into the Railway Rates of Great Britain, he will take steps for the appointment of a similar Committee by the Department of Agriculture for Ireland.

MR. WYNDHAM: My right hon. friend the President of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries has appointed a Departmental Committee to inquire as to the rates charged by railway companies in Great Britain in respect of the carriage of foreign and colonial farm, dairy, and market garden produce from the ports of shipment or of arrival, to the principal urban centres. For some time past the Irish Department of Agriculture has been collecting information affecting rates on agricultural produce and other commodities in and from Ireland. When this inquiry is complete the Department will be in a better position to consider whether a public investigation of a more general character could be usefully undertaken. The information to be obtained by the Committee appointed by the Board of Agriculture will be of value for Irish purposes also.

MR. FIELD: But is it intended to take evidence from Irish people who are interested? What is to be the form of the inquiry?

MR. WYNDHAM: That Question had better be addressed to the representative of the Board of Agriculture in this House.

MR. FIELD: But I want to know what is to be done in Ireland?

MR. WYNDHAM: That depends on the result of the inquiry now being pursued.

MR. FIELD: This has been going on for five years.

Gambling in Cotton.

MR. FIELD: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he is aware that the United States Government is co-operating with the Cotton Exchanges in America with the object of making corners in cotton almost impossible, with a view to safeguard the American cotton spinners and manufacturers from the evil effects of gambling in futures; and, if so, whether His Majesty's Government will also propose similar steps to the Cotton Exchange in Liverpool with the same object, for the benefit of the cotton industry and those dependent upon its working.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): No information has reached us indicating that the United States Government had taken the steps mentioned in the Question with the view of dealing with this particular form of gambling.

Licensing Bill—Time Limit.

MR. J. A. PEASE (Essex, Saffron Walden): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the Government will be prepared in the Committee stage of the Licensing Bill to favourably consider an Amendment whereby a time limit may be inserted, after which no compensation will be payable for the non-renewal of a licence, and thus gradually eliminate the creation of private property in a licence granted by the State, instead of establishing a permanent freehold in a licence such as is now created by the Bill.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The Question of the hon. Member seems to be put in the form of notes for a speech on the Bill, rather than in the form of a Question which it is desirable to answer across the floor of the House at Question time. I traverse the premisses on which he proceeds; but I shall, probably before the afternoon's debate is concluded, have to say something on this question of a time limit, and perhaps that may serve in lieu of an answer at the present moment.

MR. J. A. PEASE: May I assume that the Solicitor-General yesterday, when he indicated that the Government were prepared to entertain this proposal, was speaking for himself or for the Government.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I heard no such statement from my hon. and learned friend.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): May I ask whether the First Lord of the Treasury is able to make any statement on the pleasant subject of the holidays?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: As far as I can forecast the course of public business, it will be possible for us to adjourn for the Whitsuntide holiday on Thursday, the 19th, and meet again on Tuesday, May 31st. The Supply for to-morrow, after the Post Office Vote, will be the Customs (Inland Revenue) Vote.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES: There is a notice of Motion on the Paper by the President of the Board of Trade that the proceedings upon the Port of London Bill be resumed. That Bill is of a very debateable character, and as the Motion can be taken after 12 o'clock I should like to know whether that is the intention of the Government, or whether the Motion can be taken at an earlier period of the day.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not think any serious inconvenience will occur in taking a division at 12 o'clock. It is not as if there can be a long debate, and I hope no one will wish to divide the House.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES: Oh, indeed they will. Besides, at 12 o'clock the House is very empty.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: It is quite fit to take a division.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: What business will be taken on the day when the House meets after the holidays?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: It will be Supply.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: What will be the business on the following day—Derby Day? If the Government will take non-controversial business on the first few days after the holidays it will be a great convenience.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I am in some difficulty in arranging business to suit every one, but I will endeavour to make the business for Wednesday and Thursday after the holidays as little congenial to racing men as I can.

Sir J. DICKSON-POYNDER (Wiltshire, Chippenham): Will an opportunity be found before Whitsuntide for the discussion of the new Army scheme?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Not before Whitsuntide, but at no distant date afterwards.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Will the Motion for the adjournment be moved on Thursday, and will that be the only business?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I intend simply to put down the Motion for the adjournment, and there will be no business after the adjournment is settled.

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Mr. Halsey reported from the Committee of Selection, That they had discharged the following Member from the Standing Committee on Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufactures:—Mr. John Redmond, and had appointed in substitution: Mr. Jordan.

Report to lie upon the Table.

COMMITTEES (ASCENSION DAY).

Motion made, and Question put, "That Committees do not sit To-morrow, being Ascension Day, until Two of the Clock.—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

The House divided:—Ayes, 112, Noes. 96. (Division List No. 117.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Mich. Hicks
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith

Bowles, T.Gibson(King's Lynn
Brymer, William Ernest
Burke, E. Haviland
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Crean, Eugene
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Davenport, William Bromley
Delany, William
Denny, Colonel
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Donelan, Captain A.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Fellowes, Hn. Ailwyn Edward
Field, William
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Forster, Henry William
Foster, P. S. (Warwick, S.W.)
Fyler, John Arthur
Gore, Hon. S.F.Ormsby-(Linc.)
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
Gretton, John
Hamilton,Marq of(L'nd'nderry
Hammond, John
Harris, Dr. Fredk. R. (Dulwich
Hayden, John Patrick
Heaton, John Henniker
Hoult, Joseph
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kerr, John
Kilbride, Denis
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, J. Grant (Yorks., N.R.
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Lowe, Francis William
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J.(Portsmouth
Lundon, W.
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W (Sligo, North)
Mooney, John J.
Mount, William Arthur
Murphy, John
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Pease, Herb. Pike (Darlington)
Percy, Earl
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Power, Patrick Joseph
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Pym, C. Guy
Rankin, Sir James
Ratcliff, R. F.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Reid, James (Greenock)
Ritchie, Rt.Hn.Chas. Thomson
Roche, John
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Seely, Maj.J.E.B.(Isleof Wight
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sheehan, Danel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Smith, H C(North'mb.Tyneside
Spear, John Ward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Webb, Colonel William George
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Talbot and Sir John Kennaway.

NOES.

Ashton, Thomas Gair
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bell, Richard
Black, Alexander William
Blake, Edward
Brigg, John
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Crombie, John William
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Evans, Sir F. H. (Maidstone)
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Graham, Henry Robert
Griffith, Ellis J.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Jones, D. Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Langley, Batty
Lawson, Sir Wilrid (Cornwall)
Leese, Sir Jos. F. (Accrington)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
M'Crae, George
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Mitchell, Edw.(Fermanagh, N.)
Moore, William
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Parrott, William
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Price, Robert John
Randles, John S.
Rea, Russell
Reid, Sir R.Threshie (Dumfries
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt.Hn.C.R(Northants
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, D. Alfred (Merthyr)
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Walrond, Rt.Hn.Sir WilliamH.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, Jn. Cathcart (Orkney)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Wilson, J.W.(Worcestersh. N.)
Wood, James
Woodhouse,Sir J.T(Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Lough and Mr. Thomas Bayley.

LICENSING BILL.

[Second Reading.]

Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on Amendment to Question [9th May], "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Which Amendment was—

To leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day six months."—(*Mr. Burt.*)

Question again proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Mr. ELLIS GRIFFITH (Anglesey) whose speech was interrupted at midnight yesterday, said that on the previous night they had several noteworthy speeches. One of them was that of the right hon. Member for East Somersetshire who said he was against perpetuating vested interests, opposed to drastic interference with the discretion of the magistrates, held that compensation should be an assistance and not a hindrance to the reduction of licences, and that there should be a fuller discretion in quarter sessions. How could the right hon. Gentleman reconcile those views with his announced intention to vote for the Bill—not because of what it was, but because of what he hoped it would be after it had passed through Committee? The senior Member for Oldham had said he should vote against the Bill with reluctance. Well, he should also vote against the Bill, but without any reluctance.

What was the origin of the Bill? It was idle to tell the Prime Minister there was no mandate for the Bill, for he had given up the doctrine of mandates to that House. But in the absence of a mandate there ought to be a public opinion in favour of the Bill. As a fact, however, there was no public opinion in favour of this Bill. It was all public-house opinion. The origin of the measure was to be found in the deputation from the trade which waited on the Prime Minister last year. The right hon. Gentleman on that occasion was addressed by two Gentlemen who were Members of that House, both of them connected with a trade which, as he thought, was to be supported and protected by the Bill. The Prime Minister in the course of his speech—a speech marked by his usual diplomacy—thanked the deputation for being so reticent. Probably he found it in consequence far more easy to deal with then than he found it in the case of the Bishops who approached him with reference to another Bill. The Prime Minister said to the deputation that the trade was subjected to a very serious and unjust strain. The word "strain" was a very familiar one to those on that side of the House. It used to be an "intolerable strain," now it was a very "serious and unjust strain." The Prime Minister then begged his hearers, the Licensed Victuallers Association, to trust the Government and see what would happen. They had trusted the Government, and they now saw what had happened in the production of this Bill. The Prime Minister was very hard on the licensing justices, and on the local magistrates, and spoke in very severe terms about a body of men of whom he used to entertain higher views. In former days the Prime Minister was an eager champion of the justices.

The PRIME MINISTER and FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.): Does the hon. and learned Gentleman suggest that I attacked the justices as a whole in that speech?

Mr. ELLIS GRIFFITH said he did not understand the Prime Minister's question. He attacked some justices, he did not attack the justices who renewed the licences. He spoke sympathetically to the deputation of the liquor trade in regard to their complaint that there were some justices who took away their licences, whereupon the right hon. Gentleman spoke severely of some justices. Did not the right hon. Gentleman agree with him in the conclusion that the justices of whom he spoke severely were the justices who refused renewals, that these were the men who had given offence to the trade? The Prime Minister said to the deputation that he was a moderate temperance reformer, He did not know whether the right hon. Gentleman professed to be a temperance reformer on temperance lines; but, as he understood the right hon. Gentleman, he held out this Bill as a measure which did protect the trade, but that, after all, it was a very great temperance measure.

Might he not congratulate the temperance party that, although all their efforts had failed to get the Government to introduce this reform, it had remained to the liquor trade to obtain the introduction of this Bill which was to effect a great temperance reform? It did not look like that at first, but if it were so so much the better. It was very unfortunate to be an extreme man in this matter; but the moderate temperance party had always asked for certain things. They had asked that there should be full discretion as to the ante-1869 beerhouse licences. That was not in the Bill. That the magistrates should have power to close public-houses earlier than eleven o'clock in towns, and open not later than eight o'clock. That was not in the Bill. That the licensing magistrates should have some measure of control over six or seven days licences. That was not in the Bill. And yet, this was a great measure of temperance reform! Before the Farnham case was decided, the justices were all that was excellent, but the moment that case was taken to the House of Lords and it was decided that the licensing justices should themselves have power to object to the renewal of licences, no words had been too hard to throw at these licensing justices. At last the trade came to the Prime Minister and he had given the trade the last blessing of a dying Government. And here they had the Bill which gave the trade a return for all the political assistance which they had given to the Conservative Party for many years past. In regard to the temperance party, he thought he could quote the words of the Prime Minister, from a letter which the right hon. Gentleman sent to a Member on that side of the House. The right hon. Gentleman might have benevolent intentions towards the temperance party, but he concealed them very effectually.

If this measure were really to lead to temperance reform, he thought it would have been much more certain of acceptance in that House than at present. A Licensing Commission was appointed by the present Government, composed of eight representatives of the trade, eight representatives of the temperance reform party, and eight gentlemen who were supposed to hold opinions between the two extremes. Now, it was unanimously agreed by these twenty-four gentlemen that there should be a large reduction of licences. The only difference was that whereas the majority limited themselves to saying that there should be a reduction, the minority said that the reduction should be "immediate." The question now was, did the Bill make the reduction of the number of licences more easy or more difficult? There were two principles in the Bill. First of all the principle of transferring the power now enjoyed by the local licensing justices of granting or withholding licences from these justices to the quarter sessions; and second, the question of compensation. He thought it was universally agreed that the present licensing justices had a local knowledge which was unknown to the bench of quarter sessions; and that the necessity, or otherwise of a public-house was eminently a question of local knowledge. If it was a question of poaching, he was willing to transfer that to the quarter sessions, for local knowledge was there a disadvantage. But in the case of a licence to a public-house the local justices must know more about the requirements of the neighbourhood, and also about the management of the public-house. That was a point which should be kept in mind. It was well that the licence-holders should know that there were gentlemen in the locality, before whom they must appear to ask for a renewal of their licences, who knew the manner in which their houses were conducted; and that if they were to get those renewals they must keep good order in their houses. One of the blemishes of the Bill was that the licence-holders would become more careless, and more casual, so to speak, in the conduct of their houses when they knew that the obtaining a renewal of their licences would not depend on the local justices. If this Bill was to facilitate the reduction of licences, the local magistrates had been right all along, except on the doctrine of compensation. The only complaint the Prime Minister had against the local magistrates was that they did not go rapidly enough, and this Bill was, according to the argument of the Government, to be the motive-power to reduce licences more rapidly than in the past. Might he quote a short extract from what the Secretary of the Royal Commission said about quarter sessions? That gentleman said—

> "The sins of the licensing justices in the first instance are chiefly sins of omission; the fact that they live in the district and must know something of what goes on there has no doubt some good effect. But it is not too much to say that the justices at quarter sessions have done their very best on many occasions to suppress any effort of the local justices after good administration. Here we have not a mischievous inactivity to complain of, but an actual, almost malignant, activity, the paralysing effect of which can hardly be estimated. It must be remembered in estimating the efforts of the borough justices that they always have this deadweight of county quarter sessions to contend with—quarter sessions from which they are excluded. . . . If there is anything at all in the principles of local self-government, in which all Englishmen believe, our towns and cities must be able to manage their own business better than a purely external authority, superior in no degree, always inferior in some respects, and often in all, to the local authority. For the appeal lies from the borough justices to a shifting set of county justices, who know less of the local circumstances, are not superior in ability nor better lawyers—an appeal, too, on points of administration, not of law merely. Sometimes a decision arrived at after most careful consideration and with a full knowledge of the history of a house by a most competent bench of city justices is reversed by two or three county justices, sometimes by a perfect mob whipped up by a doubtful influence from all parts of the country."

And yet that was the body of men to whom this Bill was going to transfer the power of granting or refusing licences.

MR. LLOYD WHARTON (Yorkshire, W.R., Ripon): From whom is the hon. Gentleman quoting?

MR. ELLIS GRIFFITH: From the Secretary to the Royal Commission on Licensing.

MR. LLOYD WHARTON: In what capacity?

MR. ELLIS GRIFFITH: The Secretary to the Royal Commission. The right hon. Gentleman must well know the gentleman, for he took part in a vote of thanks to that gentleman for the excellent work he had done as Secretary to the Royal Commission.

MR. LLOYD WHARTON: The hon. Gentleman quoted these remarks as if the gentleman mentioned was part of the Royal Commission. [Cries of "No, no." He quoted him as having the weight of Secretary to the Royal Commission.

MR. ELLIS GRIFFITH: The right hon. Gentleman is, perhaps, overrating the weight of the remarks of the Secretary to the Royal Commission. At any rate he did not insinuate for a moment that the gentleman was a member of the Royal Commission. But the gentleman, by reason of his connection with the Royal Commission, had very exceptional opportunities for speaking on this matter. At present the local licensing justices had a local knowledge to enable them to come to a decision as to whether a licence should be granted or refused, and under the Bill all that was gone. All they had to do was to express an opinion and report to quarter sessions whether the licence was required or not. One of the objections he had to this Bill was that it not only transferred the jurisdiction from the local justices to the quarter sessions, but that it transferred it from one kind of body to quite another kind of body—from a consultative committee to a Court of law. The words used throughout the Bill were "quarter sessions," but when they came to Section 8 Sub-section 3 (and this was an important point) the words were—

> "In this Act the expression 'county' includes any riding, part, or division of a county having a separate Court of quarter sessions."

He supposed it was a Court, and if that was so, when the applicant for a licence went to a Court, legal principles would govern the decision as to his application. There was, therefore, a great change in that respect.

Having said so much on the transference of the jurisdiction from the local licensing justices to the quarter sessions, he would pass to the question of compensation. He thought it was a mistake for hon. Gentlemen on the other side of the House to suggest that because a man lost something he should be paid by the State for it. There were cases where losers of property had not been paid by the State. There was the well-known case of the slave-trade where the slaving shipowners did not receive compensation. When the Welsh Sunday Closing Bill became an Act no compensation was given, yet under that Act one day in seven was taken away from all the publicans. All they knew was that the liquor trade was a business, and they suspected that it was a profitable business. All those who had taken up licences had taken them up with their eyes open, knowing perfectly well that it was an annual tenancy and had taken it up subject to that risk, and no doubt made their profits on account of that risk. Until the time when "Sharpe *v.* Wakefield" was decided, they thought it might go on for ever, but since then every penny invested in this trade had been invested with the knowledge that a licence was an annual grant. It was twelve years since that had become clear law, and since then £91,000,000 had been subscribed or issued in connection with brewery companies, and he should have thought it was quite clear that the investors of that £91,000,000 were entitled to no compensation whatever. Some amusement had been created by the argument that this was a property which might contribute to the State, but there was good authority for the suggestion. The right hon. Member for West Bristol, on 14th May, 1902, had said that though it was suggested that a large revenue might be derived from a licence duty, his view was that while more revenue ought to be derived from this source, if it was derived it ought to go towards local taxation, and not to the Imperial Exchequer. The hon. Member for East Somerset had said yesterday something about robbing Peter to pay Paul; this was robbing the taxpayer to pay Paul the publican, because they took away a licence which was not necessary. He submitted that compensation was not necessary; the licence-holders were monopolists, whose monopoly, curiously enough, had been made stronger and more secure by the action of the temperance reformers in objecting to more licensing, and a monopoly gave its own compensation as it went along. In this Bill they were going to charge for new licences, and the money so derived was to be put in the reduction fund. That was a most curious thing, because the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister had said that if a new licence was granted the monopoly value should be added to the fund for the reduction of licences. The meaning of that was that the monopoly value should go to the public. If, then, the right hon. Member for West Bristol was right, that money ought to go to the local authority, but the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister said although it should go to the public it should go to the reduction of licences, so that although it was to a certain extent a public fund, it went, as a matter of fact, to compensate the publicans. In other words, this compensation fund was increased by money that ought, in ordinary circumstances, to go to the public.

He objected also to the inadequacy of the compensation fund. Instead of making reductions dependent on the levy, the levy should have been made dependent on the reduction. Once let the Government give the magistrates a free hand to reduce the licences at their own discretion, and then allow the quarter sessions to levy a rate on the remaining licences, a great blot would be removed. According to the Colonial Secretary the city of Liverpool had estimated the amount of the compensation fund at £35,000 and the average licence value at £500, which would enable the licensing authorities to reduce licences at the rate of about seventy a year. If, on the other hand, the average value of those licences was, as the Home Secretary seemed to think, £1,000, it would make a very great difference. The compensation fund would be inadequate also when they came to deal with one locality. In his own locality there was one licence for every 277 people; the fund was £721 a year, which would enable them to take away three-quarters of a licence every year, which would take them seventy-five years, about, to arrive at the figure quoted in the Minority Report. The scheme was also unfair, because when one licence was taken away it would increase the value of those that were left, and he knew a case of a brewer who had six licences in one locality who would get compensation twice over, first upon the licence taken, and second upon the extra profit from the other houses, owing to the absence of competition from the one that had been closed. The alternative to the scheme of this Bill was to ask the licence-holders to insure. It might be said that that was impossible, but The Licence Holders Insurance and Guarantee Fund, which had only been in existence six years, already insured licences to the extent of £60,000,000 or 60 per cent. of the whole, In his opinion this was not a step in the right direction; it made temperance reform more difficult, and when the time came he should move that Wales should be excluded from its operation. For these reasons: because he thought the Bill was not a temperance measure, because it took away the discretion that might be fairly left to the justices, and put a stop to all temperance reform and experiment, he should oppose it.

*MR. GRETTON (Derbyshire, S.) said there were not many Members who had had the courage to argue that the principle of compensation was in itself wrong and should not be embodied in a Bill. There had been an extraordinary amount of unanimity among Members on the other side of the House, some of whom opposed the Bill on principle, and some who opposed this particular form of compensation, that compensation of some sort should be given where licences were not renewed. He did not propose to argue the question whether compensation for licences which might be suppressed in the public interest was right or just. He believed that compensation in some form or another was favoured by the majority of Members of that House, and until that principle was recognised by law there would be an impenetrable obstacle to the progress of temperance reform. He regarded this Bill as a compulsory measure of insurance. The hon. Member for Anglesey had just stated that the licensed trade was at the present time able to insure itself against the loss of their licences, taken away on the grounds of redundancy and non-requirement. That was not the case. All insurance companies had in late years absolutely declined to take the risk, which was specially excepted from the terms of the policies. The risks which they did insure were those of suppression, on the ground of breach of law, or because of some fault on the part of the licence-holder. Even if this Bill were passed, that kind of insurance would still be necessary. He traversed the statement that the trade would be relieved in any degree from the necessity of insuring against these risks. On the other hand there was this other serious risk which had grown up and increased rapidly of late years, the risk of suppression by the wish of the licensing Bench, not through any fault of the licence-holder, but on some ground of public policy or to reduce the number of licences. It was that difficulty which the insurance scheme in the Bill was intended to remedy, and if it became an Act of Parliament it would provide a workable scheme of compulsory insurance such as could not be undertaken at the present time by any commercial corporation; because how could they insure against a risk which they were unable to estimate.

The Bill had been objected to because the fund which it was proposed to provide was said to be inadequate. Looking at that part of the question as a trader himself, and as one very well acquainted with the general views of the licensed trade, and from the point of view of the trade, the levies which would be made under this Bill would be very large indeed. They were three times as large as would have been made under the scheme introduced some years ago by Lord Goschen, and four times as large as under the scheme of 1888, brought before the House by the right hon. Member for Croydon. It had been objected that the retail trader would have to pay and that he would get no advantage out of this scheme. He thought he might claim to know something of the views which the licensed trade held upon that point. That was not their view at all. The brewers, where they had an interest in the licence, at present paid the insurance premium, and they were working out the figures of the Bill with the expectation that they would have to pay this insurance premium. If there was any doubt as to whether the retail trader would get his fair share out of the compensation fund, he could say the retailer himself held no doubt on that point. They welcomed the declaration made by the Home Secretary that he was willing to consider Amendments which would make that point absolutely clear and beyond cavil on the part of those who would have to administer the law.

It had been said that the brewing trade was making enormous profits. They had listened to cant of that kind on many occasions. He had taken the trouble to work out what was the profit of the brewing trade. He was informed yesterday that a representative London brewery with a capital of £4,000,000 made a gross profit last year of £211,000. He did not think that a profit of 5 per cent. was an excessive one in a commercial business. Lord Grey's Trust companies took some credit for being satisfied with a profit of 5 per cent. He (Mr. Gretton) had taken all the figures in the official returns of the Stock Exchange relating to brewery companies, and he found that on the whole of the capital, at nominal value, the profit amounted to £5 5s. 11d. per cent., or if they took the market value £5 5s. 6d. per cent., and that did not include anything that might be called inflated value. It must be remembered that the shares of brewery companies were not held by a few individuals; but were distributed over the community. When they were attacking the profits of brewery companies, which were legal trading companies, they were attacking the pockets not of a few individuals in this country, but omit a large number of small investors who could ill afford to sacrifice any portion of their capital invested.

It had been said that this Bill would confer a freehold on the holders of the licences. That could never be the case while the Licences Acts of 1828, 1872, and 1902 were still in force. The restrictions and prohibitions which these Acts imposed upon the licence-holder would prevent the property of the licence-holder becoming a freehold. The Bill, if passed, would remove a serious injury which was being inflicted upon a certain number of individuals in this country. It would enable the Benches of magistrates to reduce the number of licences, where desirable, without injury to the individual. After all the licence-holder was not a malefactor to be hunted down, not a criminal to be pursued and driven out of the country; he was a legalised trader, whom the State had recognised for a great number of years, and he was entitled to the consideration of the House. Though he thought this Bill was open to considerable criticism on some grounds, and needed amendment, it did undoubtedly contain the principle of compensation in a workable form and he should certainly support its Second Reading.

*Mr. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.) remarked that as an Irish Member he ought almost to have apologised for intervening in this debate, because in the first place the Bill did not affect Ireland, and in the second place the Licensing Acts which governed the trade in Ireland were wholly different from those which governed the same trade in England. But even upon that point he thought something was to be learned from Ireland, because it so happened that in 1878, by a decision in the High Court, the discretion of the magistrates was taken away, and he thought he could say that the opinion of almost every thinking man in Ireland who had any experience of the licensing system was that from that day to this the drink curse had been supreme in the land, therefore they could learn something even from Ireland on that question.

He had listened to almost every speech that had been made in the debate, and he was bound to say that he had listened with something bordering upon amazement to what had been said by the extreme men on this question. He did not know whether the House would consider that he was an extreme man—very probably it would—but he must be allowed to say this: he was one of those who remembered and heard the speech made by Mr. Bruce in introducing his Bill in 1871. He strongly supported Mr. Bruce's proposals outside the House. He thought the temperance party made a great mistake in not rallying to the support of that Bill and he said so. The Government probably were unnecessarily alarmed by the opposition, but whether they were supported or not they withdrew the Bill. The right hon. and learned Gentleman the Solicitor-General said that Mr. Bruce in that Bill proposed radical measures of compensation. Mr. Bruce denied that there was any legal claim on the part of the publicans, but whilst stating that, he admitted a *quasi*-right. What he did propose was to grant a ten years licence, at the end of which period a scheme of reduction was to take place at the will of the magistrates and the ratepayers; but Mr. Bruce never proposed to give the publicans one single farthing of money compensation. He also heard with something like amazement the Solicitor-General quoting Mr. Gladstone. That had become a very fashionable practice nowadays. It was true that Mr. Gladstone stated when the hon. Member for Camborne introduced a Local Option Resolution that the Resolution was defective without some reference to compensation, and that he would be unable to support it; but if anybody wanted to know what Mr. Gladstone's views on compensation were, apart from the abstract view, he would remind them that he was Prime Minister when Mr. Bruce introduced his Bill, and was responsible for that Bill as much as Mr. Bruce was. Mr. Gladstone's Government of that day saw no reason why money compensation should be given. Then Mr. Gladstone was in the House in 1888, when the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Croydon proposed actual money compensation. What was Mr. Gladstone's attitude then? He denounced it as an endowment of the brewers and refused to support it. It was all very well to quote Mr. Gladstone's views on compensation in the abstract; but when it came to the concrete Mr. Gladstone refused money compensation in 1871, and protested against it in 1888. He (Mr. Russell) again supported in 1888—extreme man that he was—the proposal of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Croydon, and he would have been glad to have seen it passed. The real truth was that he had been for forty years so impressed with the political power of this trade, and with the difficulty of dealing with it, that he had been reluctant to oppose anything that would leave a chance of doing some good.

What were extreme men after all? Was it not time this talk ceased? An extreme man on any question meant a man who had settled convictions. He knew it was popular now to have unsettled convictions. The worst that could be said about extreme men upon this issue was that their convictions were those of a lifetime. Their convictions had been formed from fighting this great evil; and it would be found that when a Bill had been introduced for the reform of the drink trade, those men with convictions, although they had stated plainly it was not their plan, had supported it. And what had generally happened? The drink trade had thwarted the Government in everything, and the "extreme men" had been proved to be not so far wrong after all. The extreme men had been blamed for the non-success of the various experiments which had been made, whereas the Government had the majority, and if they really believed in their reforms they ought to have pushed them to a successful issue, but that was what they had not done. What kind of support had been given to this Bill? Apart from the Treasury Bench, at least three enthusiastic speeches had been made in favour of the Bill, and they were all by lawyers. The whole argument had been "Property, property, property!" He was not opposed to property, but he wanted all kinds of property to be taken into consideration.

It was said that seven-tenths of the public houses in the country were tied to breweries. What became of the tenants of those houses who held their positions under monthly or half-yearly agreements? They were turned out. Had the House no sympathy for those men? When a licence-holder failed to get a renewal it was a sacrifice of property, but there was no compensation for the hundreds of brewers' tenants who held under agreements and were turned out without scruple or a penny of compensation. Had the House no right to look beyond the licence-holder to the victim of the trade? What about the wife who was made a widow and cast upon an unkindly world? What about the children who were orphaned by tens of thousands through this trade? Had they no property to protect? Was the House of Commons, the great council of the nation, to think only of the property of the powerful brewers, while they neglected the property of their victims? He was getting tired of lawyers' speeches; it was high time they came to grips with the trade, and showed that besides the licence there was also involved in this matter questions of life or death for the people of the country.

Since he supported the Bills of 1871 and 1888, why could he not support the present measure? First of all, because of the circumstances under which it was introduced. More light was wanted upon this point. Both sections of the Royal Commission reported in favour of a large reduction of licences. That the question had been considered was proved by the fact that since the publication of that Report the Government had introduced two Bills, one for England and one for Scotland, but they had deliberately given the go-by to the question of reduction. The recommendation was at least ten years old, but no action had been taken upon it. What, then, had happened? A few magistrates in perhaps half a dozen areas awoke to their duty; the trade were panic-stricken, and called on the Prime Minister, who at once yielded to the trade what he had refused to the Royal Commission. That was the origin of this Bill. It was not brought forward in response to a demand by the public; the public had never been thought of; it owed its origin entirely to the panic in the trade caused by the action of a few Benches of magistrates. Was that panic justified? That was an important question. What had really taken place? At Liverpool during the last twelve years there had been nearly 500 renewals refused. But most of those had gone out of existence in consequence of great clearance schemes. Would anybody contend that those clearance schemes ought not to have been carried out? Nearly 200 of the cases were so bad that a renewal was not even asked for. There had been no concerted action in Liverpool for the purpose of destroying licences. In Birmingham almost all the licences which had not been renewed had been surrendered as the result of an arrangement with the brewers, who were really protecting themselves by a system of mutual insurance. Beyond those two areas there had been absolutely nothing out of the ordinary course of business. For years the magistrates had been acting upon the law in isolated cases, as was shown by the Parliamentary Returns for the last twenty years. Therefore, he contended that in considering this Bill it was the duty of the House of Commons to take into account its source of origin, and to realise that it was not a Bill brought in in response to a public demand or in the public interest.

The hon. Member for St. George's-in-the-East told them plainly what the Bill was introduced to do. He said it was not all that the trade wanted, but it was as much as they could get and therefore they were going to take it. What was it going to do? He should like the attention of those who had called themselves moderate temperance reformers to the point. This Bill proposed to do three things. It proposed to turn a yearly tenure into a freehold. Talk about extremes! He thought that was an extreme thing to do. Was there any other business in which the Government would propose to do such a thing? No other Bill ever introduced had contained such a proposal. Neither the Bill of 1871 nor the Bill of 1888 proposed to give a freehold. It was what the Government deliberately intended by their Bill. In the second place they proposed to create a legal property where none now existed in the lowest class of public-houses, the class that would be marked out for refusal, and they proposed that this should be created for the avowed purpose of sale. No Government before ever proposed such an extreme thing as that. In the third place the result of this legislation would be to invest the remaining houses with a security such as they never had before, a security which would effectually bar the way to all reform in the future. Talk about them being extreme temperance men! Those were the most extreme—"extreme" was a slight word to use, he had almost said wicked—proposals which were ever laid before the country. He fully admitted, after forty years work on this question, that if the trade was to be effectively dealt with it was impossible to escape the question of compensation in some shape or another. He did not like the word compensation, but those who were temperance reformers, whether moderate or extreme, must face the issue and deal with it.

Having made that admission let him ask this question; in the need for doing something, was it necessary—he did not speak about it being advisable—to create a legal property which was not in existence now? He desired to press that respectfully upon the Government and the House

He held it was not necessary to do so, and that the trade could be fairly dealt with without putting it out of the power of the people of this country, under happier auspices, and in more enlightened times, to do what was right with them. To hear some speakers dealing with the question, one would imagine this was the most harmless trade in existence, and that it was like any other ordinary trade. Let them never forget in dealing with it that they were dealing with a trade which was the parent of crime, of misery, of poverty, and of family suffering. This was no mere lawyers' question or a question of property, but it was a great moral and social issue, and as such it ought to be faced. What would have been the first duty of the Government if they had proposed to treat this question from the standpoint of the public interest and not from the avowed standpoint of the trade? Their first duty, starting from their own ground of no legal right, would have been to say to the trade what Mr. Bruce said in 1871. "You have no legal right and you have had no such right for centuries; your right in equity is questioned and disputed, but by the nation's connivance we recognise a *quasi* right, and we are prepared to allow a form of compensation subject to a definite time limit. That would have been a reasonable statement to make. Nobody could escape the fact that the nation had connived at this trade; they had got mixed up with it to a degree that they could not unloose themselves unless they cut the Gordian knot by some scheme of this kind. But to create a freehold and deny a time limit, and say that this compensation was to go on for ever was not reasonable. Had the Government taken the line he had suggested they would have secured the support of many of those not interested in the trade who desired to see something done, and they would not have laid themselves open to the charge of simply bringing in and passing a Brewers' Endowment Bill. They had rejected the time limit by declaring that it was inconsistent with the Bill, and therefore their only remedy was to give a simple freehold to the brewer and not to the publican. Fortunately, they were not cursed so much with tied houses in Ireland, but in this country seven-tenths of the total were tied houses. This Bill was not designed to deal with the occupier, because he could be contracted out in every agreement. This was a Bill simply for the endowment of those great brewers who had already unloaded the ship pretty well by taking the public into company with them.

It was said that at the present time applications were heard and adjudicated upon by certain justices sitting in brewster sessions, but the decisions of such justices were subject to appeal at quarter sessions. That was the law now. Substantially they said the Bill did not alter the power of the justices sitting at brewster sessions, but at any rate the power to refuse an application was expressly taken away and that right was reserved for quarter sessions. What the justices at brewster sessions were entitled to do was simply to make a report and send it on to quarter sessions. Was not that a great and far-reaching change? What had been the whole history of this question for the last fifty years but a record of conflict between the local justices and quarter sessions? The words of Mr. Sidney Peel had been read out. He (Mr. Peel) had heard the whole of the evidence, and he had no hesitation in saying that the one salient point had been the conflict between the local justices and the quarter sessions, one refusing licences and the other overruling their decisions. This right of the justices in brewster sessions was taken away under this Bill. At the present moment the public had a right to intervene and give evidence in these Courts. The public often possessed evidence which the police were not in possession of. Where in this Bill was this right of the public preserved? Why in the Bill did they give special authority for the licensed victuallers to be heard? Why did they conserve their right and leave the right of the public derelict? The public had a right to be there; that right was recognised by law, but it was not recognised in the Bill, and he thought they would find if the Bill passed in its present shape it would not be recognised by the Court.

He did not feel qualified to discuss the financial question as to whether the levy would be adequate for the purpose. He had an idea that it would not. But in all the calculations he had heard made on the floor of the House it had been quietly assumed, and he objected to the assumption, that quarter sessions all over the country were going to work the Bill when it became law. Was there any authority for that? Look at the record in the past. Did anybody imagine that the quarter sessions were composed of temperance reformers, extreme or moderate? Nothing of the kind. He thought they would find what would happen would be this. The trade knew perfectly well what it was doing, it knew it was fighting a great battle with itself in the last ditch, and if they did not get this now they never would. Did anybody imagine the trade coming to the House, and with the greatest unanimity consenting to additional taxation of £1,200,000 a year if they thought it was going to be levied? The trade believed nothing of the kind. What did the trade stipulate in the room where they met the Prime Minister? They did not stipulate for compensation, they stipulated that the power of refusal by the magistrates should be suspended. They did not want compensation, they wanted to be left as they were. When he read the Bill and saw the power transferred to quarter sessions which had been for half a century wholly opposed to this work, undoing it when they had a chance; when he saw them vested with the sole power of forming compensation areas and levying compensation funds, he took their past, and judged from that what they would do in the future. The trade, having the right hand of the magistrates paralysed by the power of refusing being taken away, would not trouble about compensation.

There was another thing which wanted clearing up, and the Prime Minister was involved. He was not going into the question whether the money was public money or not. That was a fair subject of dispute, but one thing was clear, and it was that there was going to be an attempt made to get something like the monopoly value of new licences, and any one securing a new licence would be made to pay for it something like the true monopoly value. Under the Bill as some lawyers read it that money was to go into the compensation fund, and the right hon. Gentleman in his speech on the First Reading took that view. Whatever they might say about the increased licence duty being public money, he wanted to know what defence there was for taking this monopoly value of new licences and giving it for the purposes of compensation? Reading the Bill as a whole, considering its real source of origin, and the circumstances under which it had been introduced, and under which he supposed it would be carried, and also considering that a general election could not be far distant, he had come to the conclusion that it was not designed to promote the public welfare but to enfranchise the brewer. It not only endowed the brewer with money, but it did what was far worse, it gave up the rights of the Licensing Courts which belonged to the public. If he gave a £5 note to voters to vote for him he should be guilty of a corrupt practice, but here was the House of Commons proposing to give a great money consideration to this rich trade. What did it mean? The man in the street was often referred to. He would know what it meant. It meant that the men engaged in the trade were to be bribed wholesale into voting for this Government.

SIR JOHN GORST (Cambridge University) said he intervened in this debate on account of the remarks made by several members of the Government upon those in favour of compensation, and also of a time limit. There were a number of hon. Members who were perfectly willing to entertain the idea of compensation to those dispossessed of their licences, but who wished to give exactly what was just—neither too much nor too little. Many of them thought that what was given in the Bill was too much. The Colonial Secretary in his speech treated the idea of a time limit with derision, and the Home Secretary last night said that such a proposal was inconsistent with the principle of the Bill. It was quite true that the Solicitor-General in the speech he made took a rather more open view, and for himself, if not for the Government, admitted that he was ready to consider any proposals made for a time limit when the Bill went into Committee. He himself should have thought that the whole question of the time limit was one appropriate to the Committee, but when the Home Secretary said that it was inconsistent with the principle of the Bill one was almost driven to say a few words on it in the Second Reading debate, and it was to that point that he would confine himself, not because there was not a great deal to say about other matters in the Bill, but the time for speaking was drawing to a close, and he should not be justified in going into the whole question.

There were two perfectly distinct classes of owners of licences dealt with in this Bill—one the holders of the pre-1869 beerhouse licences, and the other the holders of general public-house licences. It seemed to him that in claiming compensation, if their licences were extinguished, these two classes claimed it on totally different and distinct grounds. The owners of the pre-1869 beerhouses had got a Parliamentary right to the perpetual renewal of their licences so long as they conducted themselves and their houses with propriety, and if they were to be compensated, they seemed to him to have not merely an equitable, but a legal title, a Parliamentary title, to have the full capital value of the licences given to them. But the holder of an ordinary public-house licence stood in an entirely different position. It had been admitted over and over again in this controversy by the persons interested themselves that they had no legal right at all, that the law was perfectly distinct, and that it was an annual licence which had to be renewed every year. But then they said, what the most extreme temperance reformers like his hon. friend the Member for South Tyrone admitted, that by the custom which had grown up of generally renewing the licence unless there was some misconduct to complain of, these people had got a sort of equitable right to be compensated by solatium or compensation if the renewal were refused. If that custom which had grown up was now to be changed, and if their licences were to be refused on the ground that the neighbourhood did not require them, or for any other reason unconnected with misconduct on their part, it seemed to him that they could not treat these two classes in the same way and in the same measure without injustice to the one or the other. If they gave to the ordinary publican what they gave to the pre-1869 beerhouse licence-holder they gave him too much, and if they gave the pre-1869 licence-holder only what they gave to the holder of the ordinary public-house licence they gave him too little. This Bill treated both parties alike and gave to the ordinary licence-holder that to which the pre-1869 licence-holder alone was entitled.

What everybody desired to do was to buy back the public right to make the licence a purely annual licence. The public wanted to get the power of curtailing licences, and in order to do that they had to pay compensation or solatium to both these classes of holders. The right had been lost by this custom growing up. It had been lost also by the conduct of the officials in the permanent departments, in the way they had calculated and estimated the value of these licences. If they gave to the ordinary licence-holder a right to perpetual renewal which he had not got now, legally or equitably, they gave him too much, and what was proposed to be done by those in favour of a time limit was exactly what was done in Mr. Bruce's Bill many years ago. They said to the licence-holder, "You have no right to renewal but we will give you a right to renewal for a certain term." What that term should be was not a matter of principle but of detail. The time proposed by Mr. Bruce was ten years, and he would take that as an illustration. If it could be shown that the term should be more or less let that be done. What he hoped this Bill would do was that it would give every existing licence-holder the right to renewal for, say, ten years and compensation for the unexpired part of that period if he had his licence taken away. They must not be treated as if they had an indefeasible right to the renewal of their licences for ever. If a renewal of a licence were refused in 1905, the owner would be entitled to compensation calculated on the full ten years of the time limit; if he were refused in 1906 he would be entitled to compensation calculated upon nine years and so on, until in the year 1915 the right would have been entirely exhausted. After that date everybody would know, that it was a mere annual renewal of the licence. Everybody would be treated justly, because everybody would have got a distinct and definite ten years right sanctioned by Act of Parliament. Those whose licences were taken away during the ten years would get compensation for the residuary value of their licences for the period which still remained. In 1915 all the presently existing licence holders would have had their full ten years renewal, and therefore would have got a *quid pro quo* for the equitable right which they alleged they possessed now. That was the time limit which a great number of people wished to have introduced in this Bill. There would be more heard of it in Committee. He could not see how that could be inconsistent with the principle of the Bill which was to give just and fair compensation.

He thought the method of calculating and ascertaining the amount of compensation proposed by the Bill was the most extraordinary he ever saw in an Act of Parliament, and he could not see how it could possibly be carried into effect. The first thing was that some valuer was to ascertain what the value of the licensed premises was, as if this Bill had not been passed. How on earth could any valuer — the most expert, experienced in the world—say twenty years hence what was the value of a particular house at the time this Act was passed? It seemed to him to be perfectly absurd. He could see what was in the mind of the Gentleman who had drafted the Bill, but the clause was perfectly unworkable. If the Prime Minister could project himself into the future and think how the greatest valuer could say what the value of any premises would have been at the time, if this Bill had never passed as an Act, it would be extremely interesting to the House to hear his comments. He hoped the Prime Minister would interpret the somewhat conflicting statements of his Ministers, and assure the House that when they got into Committee, any proposals for assessing compensation on an equitable basis, with a time limit, would not be at once negatived by the Government, but be candidly and fairly considered.

*Mr. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.) said they had recently had a demonstration in favour of a festival of the Established Church; they were now having a demonstration in favour of the Saturnalia of the established trade. It would be said of him that he was an extreme man upon this question, but he would rather be an extreme man like those friends of his on that side of the House who had devoted their lives to the fight against intemperance than men who said that they were moderate, or like the Prime Minister who yielded at the first demand of the trade a Licensing Bill, which he had refused to moderate temperance reformers for years past. He had been in the House for nearly ten years and this was the first considerable Bill upon this question which the Government had brought in. The Government which during that period had been responsible for the public duty of dealing with public morality and national progress had failed to prevent the spread of an evil which confessedly, among all men of right thinking and wide knowledge, was the greatest evil to the race, the greatest curse of the nation, and the greatest drawback to the welfare and progress of the people. Without assuming any superiority of feeling or emotion on his part, he put it to the minds and hearts and consciences of private Members opposite, "Do you think this is the kind of Bill to deal with the drinking evil?" He knew what the answer of hon. Members would be if they could give their private opinion. It would be that a Bill dealing with this question of the drink traffic ought not to perpetuate it or endow it, or give concessions to the brewers, or give help to the great machinery for the sale of drink. It ought to be a Bill to strengthen the temperance forces of the country and the judicial powers of the country, and to give more power into the hands of the justices, not less, and tend towards sobriety—not, as he had said, to a Saturnalia.

When the Home Secretary brought this Bill forward he did so in such an artful manner that he himself was inclined to think that there might be something in the Bill which would be useful in reducing drinking, the waste of life, the enormous unhappiness, the growth of crime, the spread of disease, and the physical degeneration of the race. When, however, he looked into the text of the Bill, he was amazed at the cleverness, the ingenuous ingenuity which the Home Secretary had brought forward the Bill, and he then formed an entirely different view—that this Bill was not likely to reduce the number of licences at all. He did not find that the compulsory insurance was really compulsory, or that every proprietor of a public-house would have to pay to the compensation fund. He found that the clause to deal with the so-called *quasi*-compensation for the withdrawal of licences contained a perilous and amazingly artful method of inviting licensing magistrates to increase the number of licences. Quarter sessions magistrates might make as a condition of granting a new licence the payment of a considerable sum of money to them by the proposed licensee. What would happen in such a case? Under the present system, if a licence were applied for in a new suburb or other district where the people might not want a licensed house, they could appeal before the local justices and protest, either by counsel or otherwise, and the licensing justices, knowing the district and its requirements, could decide that another licensed house was not necessary, and there then was no inducement to grant a new licence. But this Bill took away the discretion of the local justices and gave it to the quarter sessions, the magistrates sitting at which resided at a distance from the locality in question and did not know its requirements; and they might grant this new licence if the proposed licensee were to hand over to them the monopoly value of that licence, so that they might buy out the holders of licensed houses in other parts of the town. Therefore the Bill invited quarter sessions to grant licences which they would not otherwise grant, and enabled the brewers to say that they would pay for a new licence so many thousands of pounds, as the case might be, into the compensation fund, so that out of the compensation fund they might get the money back in compensation for yielding up old licences which had ceased to be any use because the houses holding them did not pay. There was thus a pernicious, make-belief machinery for reducing licences in certain parts of a town, which licences were worthless and would drop themselves before long without any compensation. But in this Bill the fictitious money value of these houses was to be given, and if the brewer did not get that money value out of the compensation fund in the ordinary way he might be able to get it by making a payment for the monopoly value of licences in another part of the town.

It was said by the Government that this compensation was to be given to the licence-holders. How much of the money would go to the licence-holder? Many difficult questions had been put to the Government on this point. One was whether any barman or barmaid, or potman, or other servant of a licensed house would be entitled under this Bill to receive any compensation. The Government's answer was "No." Another question was whether a licence-holder, whose licence was refused renewal because it was not necessary, would, under this Act, obtain any compensation whatever unless he was part proprietor of the freehold itself. The answer to that was so vague that he had some difficulty in understanding it; but its meaning was that the licensee, who was the only man who had a right to get compensation, was not to get it unless he was part proprietor of the freehold. There was nothing in the Bill to safeguard the interests of the licence-holders nor any guarantee that there would be a large reduction of licences. Nine out of ten of the licensed houses of the country belonged to private firms of brewers and distillers, or to those honourable gentlemen and ladies up and down the country who had thought it consistent with their conception of national duty and private morality to invest their money in this trade. The compensation would, therefore, go to these private firms and great limited liability companies in respect of the false, fictitious, and inflated value attached to the houses. And thus the House were going to condemn the country for all time, and associate the ministers of justice in this country with promoting a compensation system for a trade which made every effort to buy up every licence and get as many new licences as possible in order to sell as much drink as possible. Was that a trade which this House ought to approve or support, or further, or compensate?

Under the old system the licensee was the licensed victualler who carried on his trade in a respectable way, risking his own capital if the house were badly conducted. If publicans of that type, who were often men of high character who carried on their trade like other tradesmen without deception, were now at issue he would take a different view of the situation. But the tied-house system had inveigled into its service temporary servants, tenants for a few months only. It might be an artisan who had been left £140 or £150 by a comparatively wealthy relative, and who, knowing that a great deal of money had been made in public-houses in the past, hoped to make money himself. He invested his capital in a tied house, and owing to the terms of his contract he lost his money, and out he went in the most pitiless manner without a penny of compensation. Compensation under this Bill would not go to the tenant but to the tied-house owner, who, like an octopus, had the tenant in one tentacle, the drunkard in another, and the Government in a third. That was the real nature of the Bill. His remarks in reference to the tied-house system applied to off-licences as well as to on-licences. In the old days the houses were shops owned by shopkeepers, and the brewer supplied them just as the sugar-boiler and the baker supplied shops to-day. The stuff supplied to those houses now was not only charged for at 10s. per barrel more than the market price if supplied to a free house, but it was two or three gallons per barrel short, and was a great deal under quality—under quality, under quantity, over price. The tenant was forbidden to purchase anywhere else, and he lost his money because he could not sell the stuff supplied to him at a profit and pay the interest on the nominal loan made to him by the brewery company. The Bill would not promote the reduction of licences to any appreciable extent, the licenses would not be compensated and the compensation would be given to a trade which was organised on a system which was one to deprecate, one to condemn, one to regulate, one to limit, and one to suppress, rather than one to perpetuate as this Bill proposed.

Sir JOHN KENNAWAY (Devonshire, Honiton) said the House had heard a great deal about the cause of the introduction of this Bill. It had been attributed to a brewers' panic, but that would not be sufficient to justify its introduction. A far more serious and effective cause was that it was the earnest wish of both sides of the House to effect a large reduction in licences. All attempts to reduce licences on anything like a large scale had been ineffectual, because magistrates had not felt able to enforce their powers from fear they would be doing a great injustice. The principle of the Bill was that there should be a reduction in licences, and that that reduction should be accompanied by compensation. There had been a large amount of admission from the other side of the principle of compensation. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Montrose Burghs had been effectively quoted as having said that it would be unjust to take away property which had been invested on a clear expectation of a continuance of the licence. They had a very interesting quotation given from the last election address of the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition. In that address the right hon. Gentleman assented to the principle of compensation to be found in this Bill. Now the Government had introduced that principle and it was objected to. Another principle of the Bill was that the process of reduction and control remained with the magistrates; not wholly with the magistrates in brewster sessions, but a larger and wider area was taken which was necessary for the administration of the funds coming in. Great stress had been laid by the hon. Member for South Tyrone on the fact that there had been continual friction between the brewster sessions and the quarter sessions. There were, however, great hopes that the new plan would bring quarter and brewster sessions together, and that they would in that way form an effective body for carrying out the wishes for the reduction of licences. It was true that there was no specific instruction made for the quarter sessions to take up this question. He hoped that that would be remedied in Committee, and he was sure that when their duties were clearly laid down they would not be wanting in carrying them out.

Seeing that there was so much agreement on these points, how was it that there had been such strong objection raised to the Bill throughout the country? One reason was the fear that the measure would not produce the expected results. The Home Secretary gave hopes of a very large reduction of licences within a moderate time. In Devon, excluding the boroughs, the amount available for compensation was £9,475 and there were 1,600 licences to be dealt with. In Cornwall there were 760 licences and the sum available was £4,200. It seemed to him that there would be great difficulty in proceeding at anything like a rapid rate. He doubted whether the money would be sufficient to effect the reduction which was desired. The other point raised was whether, in regard to the houses that remained, the annual licence would be turned into a freehold. He did not wish to see the trade for all time in an impregnable position, and they had no right to put the trade in such a position that twenty years hence, when the feeling of the country might be very different, the people would have no power to review the situation. If an experiment were made and proved successful they would probably be glad to continue it on the same lines; if not successful, they ought to have the opportunity of trying something else. It was with that view that the time limit had been suggested. He saw a difficulty in bringing it in, but it ought not to be beyond the power of Parliament or the ingenuity of man to devise some scheme whereby the system inaugurated under this Bill should be renewed from time to time. He believed that finality was not what was desired by the country, and while there was finality in the Bill he did not see how he could support it. A heavy burden had been laid upon the country by those who had gone before in the number of houses that had been allowed to grow up, and, while earnestly anxious for further reform on the lines of this Bill, they must be very careful not to lay on posterity burdens which would make posterity regard them as they sometimes regarded those who had gone before. The growing power of the temperance movement must also be borne in mind. It was doubtless true that owing to the unwillingness of many of its advocates to look at the matter from a reasonable point of view little had been done, but he did feel there was a great opportunity at the present time, and he hoped it would be made good use of by the Government. The Government would then deserve the credit of having grappled with the question with a wish not to suppress the trade altogether, but to do justice to all concerned and promote the cause of temperance.

*MR. THEODORE TAYLOR (Lancashire, Radcliffe) said that the speech which the House had just heard should carry some weight with the Government. The right hon. Gentleman had taken a moderate and fair view, and from what he had said it would appear that although the time limit would not meet the views of many of his hon. friends it would be acceptable to the supporters of the Government and to the country at large. As a temperance reformer himself he did not look, as some members of the Government did, on temperance reformers as the hunters of publicans. He would not reciprocate the sentiment by stating that the Government were hunters of temperance reformers. He desired to give the Government full credit for trying to do some good in the matter. He believed that they realised that the great obstacle in the way of temperance reform was a financial one—he meant the financial interest of those engaged in the liquor trade. What was the equitable title of the owner of property licensed for the sale of intoxicating liquor? They were all agreed he had no legal title; but he himself did not wish to take advantage of an illegality to perpetrate a moral wrong. No good cause could be served by doing a moral wrong by a legal right.

There were two distinct financial interests in every licensed premises, the interest of the tenant and the enormously greater interest of the man or company owning the property and who claimed compensation for the non-renewal of the licence. The whole of this measure was founded on the supposition that it was a case of extinguishing licences. That appeared in the title of the Bill, but there was no such thing as the extinction of a licence. Every licence died a natural death every year, and therefore the assumption that licences were to be extinguished was a false one. There was in equity and law a difference between the extinction and non-renewal of a licence. What happened when an original licence was applied for? As a licensing magistrate himself he could tell the House what happened in many cases twenty or thirty years ago. It was well described by the Solicitor-General yesterday when he said that the administration of the licensing system in connection with the diminution of the number of licences was on the principle of a toss-up as to which licence should be suppressed. The same principle often applied to the original granting of licences. In every freshly populated district the principle formerly was to grant new licences. There might be four magistrates and the mayor. There might be two applicants A and B. A was personally known to two magistrates, and B to the other two and both were known to the mayor. According to the code then prevailing there must be provided a place in the district where a man could get drunk, and to which of the two applicants should they grant the licence? Was not the matter for all practical purposes a toss-up? Let us suppose they gave it to A. Where was the equity as between the man who got the licence and the man who did not, both being equally deserving? The difference was that the man who got the licence received with it an additional income of, say, £50 a year. Within a year or two of getting the licence he became landlord only, in the sense of being the owner and letting the property to somebody else. For the past twenty years he has had an income of £50 a year at somebody else's expense; he has had an extra £50 a year because he has had a public privilege at a less rate than the fair market value. What had become of his neighbour B? It was well known that if they had a public-house opposite certain property it did not increase the letting value of that property but it might diminish it a little. Had not Mr. B the same right to the money which was derived from charging the public a monopoly price for the article they wanted? Had not Mr. B the same right to a share of that money that A had? It seemed to him that there should be a fresh toss-up every year, and all the letters from A to Z should have the same chance and the same opportunity of drawing money from the public purse.

There were several alternatives which the Government might have employed. They might, by raising the licence duties, have taken to themselves by degrees the value of that monopoly, or they might have given notice of a time limit and undertaken that the business should be carried on nominally as well as really in the public interest. He was not going to say a word about the pauperism and death and disease caused by drink, but he would speak of the question entirely from a financial point of view and show that the title of the property owner to draw in perpetuity the extra sum by way of rent for his house because it was licensed was not an equity that attached to him personally. They might say that as he had had it twenty or thirty years, did not that give him the right to go on for ever? They might as well say that in balloting for places in the Ladies' Gallery of the House, the Members who were successful on the first day of the session should retain the tickets for the remainder of the session. But there was another class whose interests had not been spoken of in the debate—he meant the consumers of liquor at retail. This trade was limited to certain premises and certain persons in the interest of the public, and he was one of those who thought that the persons who consumed liquor in those places should have a right to expect that the article they consumed should be good. What was the result of the monopoly? He had no charge to make against the brewers—they were only like other business men with monopolies: they were apt to take advantage of them. But in regard to the article consumed, the general public nearly always suffered by a monopoly. Most of them had been in France and knew what wretchedly bad lucifer matches they had there. That was a Government monopoly. In Italy they gave them salt almost like pebbles, and they had wretched tobacco, —again Government monopolies. He was not an advocate for monopolies where they might be avoided, but as a general principle they were bad for the consumer. It was worse when the individual monopolists were collected into groups; that was to say, when the system of the law, which nominally was one man one licence, had got to be one company fifty licences, or one company 100 licences; it was then a much worse kind of monopoly. That was what the retail sale of drink had become—a private monopoly in the hands of a smaller number of monopolists now than used to be the case. One of the blots in the Bill was that it failed to deal with the question of tied houses. That was a serious and burning question from the public point of view, and he desired to say a word in the interest of the people who consumed this liquor. Their interests should certainly be regarded by this House. Power and responsibility ought to go together. The power of the law had been exercised to restrict the sale of liquor to certain people in certain places, and the public had a right to demand that if this monopoly was to be made perpetual, some guarantee should be given that it would not be ill-used. If the financial aspect of the question were only probed to the bottom, he was convinced that the opinion of the Unionist Party would be increasingly against the perpetuation of this monopoly.

Reference had been made to a clause in the Bill which, in order to prevent any increase in the value of the monopoly, provided that the valuation should be made on the basis obtaining before the introduction of this Bill. That, however, as the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University had pointed out, was an impossibility. But if the Government seriously meant that provision as a qualification of the amount of compensation to be paid in the future, ought they not to order the valuation to be made now? An even better system would be to let every man assess himself, though in that case there would certainly have to be qualifications; why should not compensation be paid in the same proportion as the contributions were made? The objection would doubtless be taken that the licensees of the very large houses, hotels, and so on, who were not likely to be interfered with, would assess themselves too low. But when amending the law, why should they not draw a more equitable line beween houses whose main trade was the selling of drink and those whose main trade was the providing of accommodation? He was aware that a difference was already made in the licence duty, but further differentiation could be carried out with advantage. It had been too much assumed that the licensed houses whose capital value was the largest were necessarily the best. To a large extent that was true, but it was equally true that some of the worst cases of dram shops would have the largest capital value.

He had thrown out those suggestions in a practical spirit, not because he wished this monopoly to be made perpetual, but because he believed a very great financial wrong would be done to all classes of the community unless some guarantee were taken that the article supplied should be a good one and that the monopoly should not be abused. He recognised no title or moral right on the part of the property owner, who had already recouped himself, and who had done nothing, as a property owner, except to draw a superfluous income from the liquor-consuming public, but he was willing, in order to get this matter settled, that there should be some short time limit. That was as regarded the property owner. So far as the tenant was concerned, surely all were agreed that he should not suffer in any way, and that he should get at least as much compensation as the property owner ever gave him now. The tenant's interest was a small one, it was the property owner's interest that had brought the question to the fore, and the advocates of this Bill had no right to shelter themselves behind the publican. The real reason for the Bill was the pecuniary loss feared by the public-house owners. He wished to give the Government credit for a desire tempered by political considerations to promote temperance reform. As a licensing justice he admitted that it was often a toss-up which of certain original applicants was given a licence, and that the present condition of things was sometimes a hindrance to the reduction of licences. He therefore desired to see some moderate measure of reform passed, but it was altogether inequitable, both to the people who would like to be public-house owners and to the liquor-consuming public, that this monopoly should be made perpetual without any qualification. If the Government were wise they would greatly facilitate the passing of their Bill, and render it more likely to be a permanent enactment, by accepting the pressure which had been put upon them by some of their best friends in favour of a reasonable time limit.

SIR WILFRID LAWSON (Cornwall, Camborne) said hon. Members opposite in their speeches seemed to find any amount of fault with this Bill, but they concluded by saying that they were going to vote for the Second Reading. They were shortly going to divide upon this measure. It was no use talking about a time limit because there was no time limit in the Bill, and when they voted on the Second Reading of a measure they voted on the principle and not on the details of the Bill. One of the most remarkable statements he had ever heard in the House was that made by the Prime Minister when this Bill was introduced, for he said this was a great temperance measure. One was rather doubtful about this when they knew who the measure was brought in for, and they had had it stated plainly in the House. The hon. Member for St. George's-in-the-East had told them that the Bill had not been received with enthusiasm by those in whose favour it had been drafted. On the same occasion the Home Secretary said the measure was brought in to safeguard the trade. That was what the Church of England Temperance Society called a dual basis. He doubted this dual basis, for he did not think it was possible to bring in a Bill which would please the trade and temperance reformers as well. They might just as well try to bring in a Bill which would please the supporters of the Established Church and the Nonconformists, the Jingoes and the Little Englanders, or the protectionists and the free-traders. That was just the thing which the Prime Minister thought he could do, but the job he had now undertaken was even more hopeless.

What was this trade? It was like any other trade, and it would make all it could out of the public. For generations the people of this country had been struggling against drink, but how was it possible to harmonise things when one set of people were doing all they could to get their fellow-creatures to abstain from alcoholic drinks and another set were doing all they could to get people to drink, and that was their business. What a pull the trade had over temperance people. The temperance people did their work at their own cost, and they lost money and time trying to make the country sober, but the brewers were paid by results. It was said that in this drink business nobody was to blame, and that the publican had done his best; that publicans were the servants of the people, and were strictly controlled by the laws, and at all the licensed victuallers' gatherings they declared that they were not to blame for drunkenness. This reminded him of the words of Scripture, "If thine enemy thirst give him drink." They had been told that the drink trade was composed of the best of men, and that the licensed houses were good. For 400 years Parliament had been doing its best to make people sober, and he believed that 400 Acts of Parliament had been passed with the same object. They had recently passed a Bill prohibiting drink in the case of the natives in South Africa, and now they were passing a measure to supply drink to the natives of this country. Temperance organisations had been doing their best, and what was the result? It had been said by one eminent authority that had it not been for temperance organisations this country would hardly have been worth living in. Look at the position. They had had a generation of social, political, sanitary, educational, and religious reform, and where were they? Look at the slums in the large towns, and at their workhouses and gaols. All he could say was that the trail of the serpent was over all. He could not find anything that was responsible for this except the liquor traffic. Mr. Justice Grantham had recently told them that the way publicans carried on their business resulted in the most heart-breaking crimes that it was possible to imagine. Could anybody say that that was a satisfactory state of things. In the past, amid all this wickedness and misery and vice, there had been one golden thread running through our legislation, and that was that the licence was granted only for one year and was subject to annual revision. But this Bill made it more difficult for magistrates to protect the people. All those who had tried to explain the principle of this Bill so far had failed to do so. Mr. Arthur Chamberlain, who had studied this measure very deeply, said that—

> "The principle of the Bill was to create a vested interest in the annual licence and to destroy the existing magisterial discretion in refusing licences."

He wished to know what harm had the people done that they should be deprived of this protection which they had had for generations. He did not know what harm they had done except returning the present Government to power and they had suffered deeply for that. The Member for the University of Oxford on the First Reading said public-houses were the equipment of the country. He could understand them equipping the Army and Navy, but why equip public-houses. A long time ago Baron Dowse, speaking from the Bench in Ireland, said that the measure of degradation in every district was exactly in proportion to the amount of alcohol consumed there. He believed his right hon. friend was going to support this Bill for equipping the country with the means of its own ruin. He was going to support all this horror, though he was one whom they expected to represent sweetness and light. He did not know whether hon. Gentlemen had read a rather interesting paragraph in the "Political Notes" in *The Times* that morning. It said—

> "A London Conservative Member whose sympathy with the 'trade' is well known has been at the trouble to reply to most of the communications which have been forwarded to him in this connection; and in acknowledging a request from the Christian Endeavour Society that he should refuse to endorse the principle of compensation to drink-sellers, he writes:—'It seems to me that the Christian Endeavour Society have forgotten the golden rule, "Do to others as ye would they should do unto you," which surely applies even to dispossessed drink-sellers.'"

When the trade came here asking for compensation if they were told to cease their trade, were the people not entitled to call upon them for compensation for all the evil they had done? Let the crime, misery, blighted homes, blasted lives, and ruin it had produced all around be summed up, and then they would see on which side the balance stood. Could the Prime Minister, the new temperance reformer, who was starting on a new career rather late in life, give the name of a Bishop who was supporting the Bill as it stood? Could he name a clergyman, dissenting minister, magistrate, or temperance reformer of any shape, feather, or degree, in favour of the Bill? Could he name a poor publican, who would get nothing out of this Bill if dispossessed, as being in favour of it? The right hon. Gentleman had got nobody at his back except the trade. The hon. Member for Carnarvon asked the Prime Minister to do something to settle the question. He himself did not ask anything of the kind. The drink question would never be settled until the people were given complete power to protect themselves. He asked the Prime Minister at this crisis merely to let them alone and not to strengthen what the ex-Colonial Secretary called "the swollen tyranny of the drink power." What they would do in the country he would not prophesy, but he would appeal to the House not to strike a deadly blow at temperance reform, which Mr. Cobden long years ago said was the foundation of every social and political reform.

*MR. TALBOT (Oxford University) said the hon. Member for the Camborne Division had referred to some remarks he made when speaking on the question of licensing. The hon. Baronet seemed to have misconceived the purport of what he said. What he did say was that he thought it was absolutely necessary there should be places for obtaining refreshments, places for eating and drinking, and his desire was that they should be as little harmful and as desirable places of refreshment as they could be made. He made the statement when combating the views of those who seemed to wish to suppress all such houses. He wished to say a word in regard to the antagonism which was stated to subsist between the magistrates of quarter sessions and petty sessions. He had a claim to speak on this matter, having sat for many years in both capacities, and having also taken part in the work of a licensing committee. He ventured to say that those who talked of antagonism were under an erroneous impression. He did not mean to say that there was never a difference of opinion between the one Court and the other, just as there was between a Court of First Instance and the Court of Appeal, but to say that they were natural enemies was to misrepresent the position. He hoped that in Committee the Bill would make it perfectly clear that it would be the duty of petty sessions to take a survey of their district to see what public-houses were not required and not to wait for pressure from outside. The plan he would recommend was that when they had ascertained the houses that could be properly suppressed they should make a statement to quarter sessions, which would refer it to their own licensing committee. He was quite certain that quarter sessions would desire to act on the recommendations made to them by petty sessions if they could consistently do so, while at the same time exercising that higher judicial opinion on the questions submitted, which was much more likely to be for the general interest than if the power to extinguish licences were to be vested solely in petty sessions.

It had been freely stated in the course of the debate that licences were annual, and that renewals could be refused for no other reason except that there was a redundancy of licences in the district. He should like the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Fife to state to the house his views of the case of Raven and others *v.* the Justices of Southampton recently decided in the King's Bench Division. The case was reported at page 430 of the *Law Reports*, K.B. 1904. In Southampton there was a very large number of licensed houses, and except with respect to one no notices of objection were served. The ground of objection in the case which formed the exception was that the licence was not required in the locality. The house had been fully licensed for ten years and the character of the locality had not altered, except perhaps that the population had increased. The licence was refused by petty sessions, the refusal was affirmed by quarter sessions, and on appeal the Chief Justice stated that the ground on which the renewal of the licence was refused was not sufficient. Mr. Justice Lawrance concurred in, and Mr. Justice Kennedy dissented from, that opinion. The appeal was, therefore, allowed. It appeared from that decision that the magistrates had not at present, as was often asserted, absolute power to refuse renewals of licences. To say that the Bill interfered with the process of suppression of licenses now going on was a mis-statement of fact. He supported this Bill because it provided the first opening he had seen in a long Parliamentary life for something like a real reduction in the number of licensed houses. Hon. Gentlemen opposite had talked for a great many years and had never done anything in this direction. It had been stated by the Opposition that this measure provided an endowment for the brewers. He could not see an endowment for the brewers in a scheme which was to provide compensation out of their own funds. He recognised in this Bill a real practical attempt to reduce the licences of the country without inflicting an injury on the holders of the licences. It was satisfactory to have the assurance of the Government that the ante-1869 beerhouses would be included in the Bill. That reform had been asked for for years and years by moderate men, and it had never been got from either side of the House. He should certainly vote for the Second Reading.

*MR. ASQUITH (Fifeshire, E.): It is not, I can assure you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, with the hope that I can contribute any new material or indeed any fresh argument to the judgment of the House that I ask leave to state in a very few words the reasons which will compel me to vote against the Second Reading of this Bill. The Bill, as we understand from its authors, is conceived with a twofold object—to promote temperance and to safeguard the trade. I will not inquire with my hon. friend the Member for Camborne how far those objects are reconcilable one with the other; but the Bill avowedly aims at both, and it seeks to attain the first, the promotion of temperance, by facilitating the reduction of licences, and the second, the safeguarding of the trade, by providing that no licence is to be extinguished, or, to use a more accurate phrase, because there is no such thing as the extinction of a licence, that every licence is to be automatically and perpetually renewed, unless, and until, funds are available to give the dispossessed licence-holder full compensation, that compensation being measured by the whole of the enhancement conferred upon the value of the premises through a State-granted monopoly. As regards the second of those objects, I think it will be conceded by every one who has studied the provisions of the Bill that it is completely achieved. But it is on the likelihood or unlikelihood of the Bill's achieving the first of its objects that its merits as a solution or a step towards the solution of the licensing problem must be determined.

I propose, therefore, to ask the question and answer it as well as I can—Will the Bill facilitate the reduction of licences? I think we are justified by the utterances of Ministers before we approach any close scrutiny of the actual provisions of the measure, in coming to close quarters with them upon this point in a somewhat sceptical attitude. Let me explain what I mean by two illustrations. Minister after Minister has risen from that Bench in the course of these discussions to tell us that in his opinion the mere reduction of licences will have no substantial or considerable effect in the diminution of intemperance. I certainly gathered from the speech of the Prime Minister on the First Reading, and from other declarations which he has made both in this House and elsewhere, that in his view there is no proved or provable relation between the number of licences and the amount of intemperance in any given locality—in other words, between drunkenness and the multiplication of facilities for drink. That opinion may be right or it may be wrong; I am not for the moment discussing that question. But gentlemen holding such a view as that about the effect of the reduction of licences may reasonably look upon that reduction as an object, at any rate, of secondary importance. I want to ask the attention of the House to a still more striking feature in the declarations of the Government. We all know what is the genesis of this Bill. It is the redemption of the pledge given by the Prime Minister a year ago to a panic-stricken deputation which came to him to appeal to him to protect them and their business against the predatory operations of the licensing justices; and they did so, if I remember right, with the intimation—I daresay it was not explicitly conveyed, but it was politely implied—that if that appeal was not satisfactorily met, consequences of an uncomfortable and even serious character to the right hon. Gentleman and his Government would ensue. We have still ringing in our ears, many of us, the Prime Minister's response to that appeal, the words of menace which he used to the magistrates of the country, warning them to think twice and thrice before they entered upon the path of confiscation. In partial fulfilment, at any rate, of the promise, or implied promise, which was then made, we have in this Bill a transfer of licensing jurisdiction from the local justices to the quarter sessions. How was this transfer justified a couple of nights ago by my right hon. friend the Colonial Secretary? It was justified by him on the ground that these same magistrates, who according to the Prime Minister, were intending confiscators of private property, were so tinctured with neighbourly and local feeling, so easy-going, good-natured, and compliant to the village publican, that they could not be trusted to do their duty to the community, and that it was necessary to transfer the performance of that duty to the remote atmosphere of the quarter sessions. When we approach the consideration of the details of this Bill we thus start, if we look at the declarations of Ministers, with a paradox and a contradiction. The paradox is that you must go in for a reduction of licences, although you admit that in your view that may have very little effect upon temperance; and the contradiction is that you must get rid of the jurisdiction of the licensing justices, on the double ground, first, as asserted by the Colonial Secretary, that they are too partial to the publican to do justice to the public, and next, as asserted by the Prime Minister, that they are too partial to the public to do justice to the publican.

The sceptical attitude which, I think, is reasonably induced by declarations of that kind is not dispelled by a study of the provisions of the Bill itself. The case against the transfer of jurisdiction from the licensing justices to the quarter sessions has been so ably and exhaustively stated in speech after speech from this side of the House that I am not going to repeat it. But I should like to refer to one point made last night by the Solicitor-General. He said that under the existing state of things, whenever a renewal of a licence is refused, you may appeal from the licensing justices to the quarter sessions; therefore, what is the extent of the change? That would be a plausible answer to the critics of this Bill, if there be such, who regard the present system as satisfactory and as incapable of improvement. But for those who think as I do, and as I believe the majority of us do, that the present system needs reconstruction upon fundamentally different lines to those proposed in this Bill, the argument has no force. Let me explain what I mean. The licensing of public-houses, as we now know on the highest possible authority, though it does not rest on authority alone, but on common sense, is an administrative function. It is to be discharged, as the Courts have very properly held, inasmuch as both private and public interests may be affected by the manner in which it is performed, it is to be discharged in a judicial temper and spirit. But it is an administrative function. The presumption, therefore, is, with all our experience in other branches of local administration on points of that kind, that it is a function that should be entrusted to those who are familiar with, in contact with, and responsive to the requirements and opinions of the locality directly concerned. To some extent, I think, the justices who sit in brewster sessions fulfil the conditions, but only to a very limited extent. You will not get this administrative function performed with the temper and efficiency with which it ought to be performed, or in accordance with the traditions and habits of English life, until, first and foremost, you popularise the composition of the body, and take, at any rate, the step we took last year, on the suggestion of this very Government, in Scotland—that is to say, infuse into your local administrative licensing body, some popular and representative element to bring it into closer touch with the community and give it more familiar and intimate knowledge of the requirements of that community. That is the first step, I think; and the second step would be this—I should abolish the appeal to quarter sessions. In the first place, it is an appeal on a purely local matter from those on the spot to a remote and therefore less qualified body. [AN HON. MEMBER: More.] The hon. Gentleman says more. How far is he going to carry that principle? Is there to be an appeal from district councils to the county council and from the county council to Parliament? What becomes of local administration? I say it is an appeal in regard to a purely local matter. It does not matter to the inhabitants of the county town or to the gentlemen who meet at quarter sessions how many public-houses there are in a district that may be twenty or thirty miles away. The appeal is an appeal on a purely local matter from the body on the spot to a body at a distance. But there is a more serious objection still. This is an appeal on a purely administrative question from a body acting with the elasticity that ought to characterise administrative methods to a judicial tribunal which is restrained, and properly restrained for its own purposes, by rigid forms of procedure and rules of evidence which are totally inapplicable in this case. Lastly, since we must all agree that in some of its aspects at any rate, this is not a merely local matter, and that, because you are dealing with a national evil, it requires to be looked at also from a national point of view, we should provide a standard of gradual but compulsory reduction, which shall be applicable all over the country, although its application and the methods of its application should be entrusted to the local administrative body. But what does the Government Bill do? It goes exactly in the opposite direction to every one of the reforms which I have indicated. It takes away from the local authority the power of initiative. It gives to the quarter sessions not merely the power of revision which they already possess, and which I think ought to be removed from them, but the power of initiative too; and it hampers the possibility of reduction by making it co-extensive with the dimensions of a strictly limited fund which cannot exceed in any case a specified and wholly inadequate sum and which may not be brought into existence at all. Well, Sir, I say if this Bill is regarded from that point of view, the object of which is to facilitate the reduction of licences, not only is it no improvement on the present system, but it is a distinctly retrograde step.

This brings me to the other aspect of the Bill, which is connected with the topic of compensation. During the discussion last year on the Bill of the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for York, the Prime Minister twitted me with being the victim of purely verbal distinctions, and with approving the principle of compensation provided it was called by some other name. I think I used the word solatium, which excited the right hon. Gentleman's good humoured but dialectical contempt. The difference between the Prime Minister and myself depends not on a distinction of words, but on a distinction of things. What do we mean by compensation? Normally and appropriately compensation is the word used to describe the payment which is given by way of indemnity to a man who has been disturbed in the possession of a thing of which he has the legal right to the continued enjoyment. Will any one maintain that that is the case of the publican whose annual licence is not renewed? My right hon. friend the Colonial Secretary in his speech the other night said that the law speaks on this subject with a double voice. With great deference to my right hon. friend I think he is entirely mistaken. The law in this matter has only one voice. It has been authoritatively and finally expounded as long as twelve years ago in the House of Lords, and as so expounded, it amounts to this: that a publican's licence is granted only for a year, and if the justices refuse to regrant it in the exercise of an honest discretion and with regard to the interests of the community, there is no power known to the law which can compel them to regrant it. That is the law. There is no doubt about it; and I want to know from my right hon. friend the Colonial Secretary where he has caught the accents of this other voice which he declares has pronounced with equal authority in the contrary sense. Certainly it was not in the Royal Courts of Justice, where my right hon. friend is so much missed. The only indication he gave to us of the quarter in which it was heard was, I think, by a reference to a circular of the Board of Inland Revenue. I have the highest possible respect for that Board. It is a Government Department which shows wonderful zeal and assiduity in sweeping into the Exchequer by hook or by crook everything it can get from any quarter; but it cannot create, it cannot alter, and it has no authority to expound, the law, and if it be the case that the zealous spirit which is the great characteristic of that Department has led them to instruct their officers that for the purpose of estate duty, or for any other purpose, a publican's licence shall be treated as though it were perpetually renewable without regard to the circumstances of any particular case, they have done a thing which is absolutely *ultra vires.* I suspect very much that they have not done anything of the kind. It is said, "Oh, but the State does in effect recognise that the publican's licence is a thing to the tenure of which he is entitled, if not to fixity of tenure, at least to renewal, because when he dies and his estate comes to be administered the State exacts estate duty on that basis." What is the fact? The fact is that in the case of a licence, as in the case of any other perishable property—it might be a racehorse, exactly the same argument applies—which is exposed to risk, which may live or which may die, there is one way, and one way only, of ascertaining, when a man dies in possession of it, at what rate he ought to be taxed—and that is, by seeing what the property will fetch in the market. The market value of a thing is not created by the law. It is not guaranteed by the law. It is a speculation. It is what a person dealing in that market, and having regard to what he thinks are the probabilities of the case, deems it worth while to give for a highly speculative article. If it be the fact that last year, out of 100,000 licences, in the case of only 300 was renewal refused on public grounds, I say it would be perfectly monstrous when a publican holding one of these licences dies, and the State comes to take its toll upon his estate, if that estate were valued on the footing that the licence must necessarily come to an end at the end of the year. In 99 out of 100 cases it has not done so. Yes, but what has that to do with the law? The law takes a thing as it is. The law stamps a licence with the incident of perishability. The justices can renew it or not as they like. The same considerations apply equally to the case put by the Colonial Secretary where licensed premises are taken under compulsory powers by a railway company. You look at the value of the thing in the market at the moment, and on that basis the purchase price is assessed. It is most important to bear this in mind in dealing with compensation, because it bears not only on the meaning of the term, but also on the nature of the thing.

I dismiss, therefore, altogether any question of legal right. I discuss it entirely and exclusively as a mere matter of expediency. So regarded, what are the considerations which may lead a man to the opinion that some scheme of pecuniary adjustment as between different members of the trade may be sanctioned by Parliament, not being left merely to domestic arrangement, but if necessary enforced by law. In the first place, I will state quite frankly that I think it is not unfair to take into account the laxity the justices have shown in days gone by in the unnecessary multiplication of these licences. Next, I think it is possibly the case that there may still be invested in this trade a certain amount of money put there before the state of the law was clearly ascertained. But what is, to my mind, a far more important consideration is that in the exercise of their discretion at present the justices are hampered by the feeling of injustice and want of equity which necessarily arises in their minds when, as between two or more equally innocent and meritorious persons, they have to select one to be the victim, as it were, to the public interest. I am satisfied from having somewhat closely observed the matter that one of the great causes why in practice licences are not more rapidly and effectually reduced than they are is the feeling in the minds of the justices which induces them to refrain from exercising the power the law has given them in the interest of the community, and not of any particular class. These are the considerations which weigh with me. But what are the conclusions which I draw from them? First of all, that if any arrangement of this kind is made—and I think the Government agree here, at any rate in principle—the fund, whatever the fund is, must be supplied by the trade and by the trade alone; because it is the survivors who will benefit by the disappearance of the victims in the enhanced value of the monopoly which is left still better protected than before from competition. That, I think, is the universal opinion. My second conclusion is that no such scheme can possibly be sanctioned unless it is framed upon lines which do not hamper, but which facilitate, the actual reduction of licences. One of many vital objections to the scheme of the Bill is that it will do nothing of the kind. Here let me quote one or two figures—since I see the Home Secretary has dealt with this aspect of the matter—to show the inadequacy of this fund. Take the case of London. I have a few figures which are very instructive. First of all, during the *régime* of the Metropolitan Board of Works, and, next, in that of their successors, the London County Council, a large number of licensed houses have been acquired through the exigencies of public improvements. The Metropolitan Board of Works, in the sixteen years between 1872 and 1888, acquired 196 licences, the average value of each of which was £1,760. The London County Council, from 1888 to 1902, acquired 101 licences, and their average value was £2,700 each; representing a rise in value of £1,000 per licence. The figures are still more striking if you take the last four years of the period from 1888 to 1902. Then the County Council acquired sixty-eight licences, the average value of each being £3,160. Therefore we see in London two things. First, the very high average value of each licence, ranging from £1,700 to £3,100; and, secondly, the progressive increase of that value. I have satisfied myself that in the case of London alone, if you look at the sum which is allocated by the Bill for the purpose of the restriction of licences you will find the result must necessarily be of a most limited and disappointing character. In the provinces the figures would not run so high, even in large towns, and still less, of course, in rural districts; but I think it will be found that even there the sum supplied by the Bill will be wholly insufficient.

There is a third point. In any such scheme you must distinguish between the interests in a licensed premises. If it be the fact, as we are told, and I believe it is, that 75, some say 80, and even 90 per cent., of the licences are licences granted to tied houses, it is quite clear that in the majority of cases the money will be received by the brewing and distillery interests. They will receive, on the one hand, the full monopoly value of the licences which are extinguished, and, on the other hand, they, being themselves the owners of competing houses, will derive a supplementary pecuniary advantage, first of all, by the disappearance or reduction of competition, and, next, by saving in the expenses of management. So that in the case of tied houses you pay compensation twice over, and pay it to the wrong person. I say it is essential to any proper scheme of compensation that first of all the money should go to those who really lose, and, secondly, that it should not be paid twice over. Lastly, no such scheme should be sanctioned by Parliament unless it is regarded as meeting what is or ought to be a merely temporary need. All the causes which justify the interference of Parliament at all are transitory causes, losing every year their weight and effect. I think the Government must have gathered from the speeches of their own supporters, as well as from the criticisms from this side of the House, that this question of time limit is absolutely vital to the consideration of the Bill. Upon that point we have had different opinions from the Treasury Bench. The Solicitor-General declared that this was an open question, and the Home Secretary said it was wholly irreconcilable with the scheme of the Bill. It would be very instructive if the Prime Minister gave an authoritative version of the intentions of the Government in the matter.

I say that in all these points the scheme of the Bill is absolutely defective. It makes the measure of compensation in all cases the full inherent value of the licensed premises as compared with the unlicensed. It limits the amount of the compensation fund, and thereby circumscribes the power of reduction, and it recognises the right of compensation as inherent, not only in the present but in future licences for all time to come. For my part I cannot assent to any such scheme. I deeply regret with my hon. friend the Member for Carnarvon, whose speech I listened to with much sympathy last night, that the Government have not made better use of an opportunity which may not soon recur. I am not one of those who, like my hon. friend the Member for Camborne, think that there is no room in the pale of a civilised community for those who make and use alcohol. I agree most heartily with those who maintain that habitual intemperance is not only a cause, but a consequence, and perhaps as often the consequence as the cause, of bad social conditions. The evil is great. No one disputes it. The need for remedy is urgent. Everyone in the debate has admitted that Parliament for thirty years has talked much and done little or nothing, and therefore it may be said that we should welcome any instalment, however small, in the way of reform. But for my part I cannot vote for the Second Reading of this Bill because I believe it would exaggerate most of the evils of the existing system, and still more because I am certain it would introduce fresh and almost insuperable obstacles to the fruitful and permanent settlement of the most pressing of our social problems.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said the right hon. Gentleman who has just concluded the case against the Second Reading of this Bill seemed, at many portions of his remarks, almost verging to the point of giving a general approval to the objects of the Bill and the methods by which we propose to reduce licences. He always pulled himself up in time and found some reason or other for voting against the Second Reading; but upon my word there were moments during the right hon. Gentleman's speech when I think his heart was not in his cause, and that but for reasons, no doubt of a sufficient character, he might have lent a much more favourable ear to the pleadings we have endeavoured to make in favour of our scheme. What was the first cause of prejudice which prevented the right hon. Gentleman from even approaching this subject in an impartial frame of mind? It was the same cause which induced my hon. friend the Member for South Tyrone to denounce His Majesty's Government and all their works in connection with this Bill. It was that I had received a deputation of the trade, as it is called, last year, and that I had made them a speech indicating that in my opinion they possessed property of which they ought not to be deprived without compensation, and commenting, not I think severely, certainly not unjustly, upon certain proceedings at brewster sessions. That speech has been so often attacked during the debate that when the right hon. Gentleman joined in the chorus of criticism I thought it worth while to send out for it, as I confess its contents were not very fresh in my memory. I have just read it while the right hon. Gentleman was speaking, and really it seems to me a most excellent speech. I cannot imagine how any—I was going to say sober temperance reformer—how any moderate temperance reformer can find cause of complaint in it. Surely the fact that I then stated that a condition of things had been created which required Parliamentary interference is no reason why men who profess that the greatest object they have in view is temperance reform should not approach at all events with an open mind the proposals which the Government have laid before the House and the country. I do not think anyone can deny that the action of those brewster sessions was open to this criticism, that it made it absolutely uncertain in what kind of temper the magistrates of the future were going to deal with those licences. Were they going to treat the matter with the hard, logical precision which would commend itself to the hon. Baronet the Member for Camborne—were they going to consider nothing but the number of licences in the district and the wants of the public, in which case, if they held the hon. Baronet's view, they would abolish every licence in the place; or were they going to do what the great bulk of the magistrates have done for many generations, that is to try to balance the evils which the excess of licences may produce with the hardship which would be inflicted upon the publican if he were deprived of his licence without compensation?

I am quite unable to follow the right hon. Gentleman in the series of criticisms which he has passed upon this measure. He says, in the first place, that in his view there should be no appeal to quarter sessions. That is a very odd way of supporting the present magisterial system, because under that system there is such an appeal. But he would abolish it; and in the name of what would he abolish it? In the name of local government? It seems the magistrates sitting in brewster sessions represent the principle of local government; that the magistrates sitting in quarter sessions do not represent the principle of local government. On what general principle is that conclusion based? Why are the magistrates not so good an authority when they are dealing with the larger area of quarter sessions as when they are dealing with the smaller area of brewster sessions? Why does the right hon. Gentleman think that the question of compensation should be confined to the locality of brewster sessions? Manifestly, you will never get a compensation fund except you have a considerable area to draw upon. Equally manifestly, that compensation fund must be administered by the body which represents the whole of the area from which it is drawn. If those two principles are admitted, and no one has seriously attempted to traverse them, what is the use of talking to us about giving the whole control over the renewal of licences to brewster sessions and abolishing the appeal to quarter sessions? Surely that must carry with it that the whole of the compensation fund must be drawn from the district of brewster sessions?

MR. WHITTAKER (Yorkshire, W.R., Spen Valley): No.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: That follows logically. ["No."] Then the hon. Member and I have different views of logic. I have no doubt that the view of the hon. Member are founded on a longer and more profound study of the case; but to my untutored instincts in the matter it does appear that if you admit that the body which collects the fund is the body that administers it, and if you admit that the brewster sessions can only collect from the area over which they have jurisdiction any fund which they individually administer, it follows that they will collect from an area quite incapable in many cases of providing the the fund required. That appears to me enough to answer the right hon. Gentleman, but I will give him one more answer. He says that he recommends this in the interests of local government; and that statement was hardly out of his mouth when he said that it was the business of the House to lay down authoritatively the number of puplic-houses per head of the population which there should be in every district in the country. That is local government! That is allowing each little locality, each parish or small collection of parishes to manage its own affairs! It is to be told by this House precisely the number of public-houses in each of its little areas which are to exist per head of the population. That may be a good plan, but it is not local government.

Then the right hon. Gentleman passed from his criticisms of the machinery of the Bill to the more fundamental point of compensation, and he revived the recollection of an old debate we had across the floor of the House last year as to the name by which compensation should be called and as to the methods and principles on which it should be assessed. I confess that I prefer still to call it compensation. I am unconverted; but the right hon. Gentleman is converted, at all events to the extent that he has abandoned his old term. He now calls it, not a solatium, as he did last year, but a " pecuniary readjustment."

MR. ASQUITH: I think that the right hon. Gentleman objected to a Latin word. I took it from Birmingham.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes, and I was just going to add that I hailed with satisfaction the change from Latin to English, and this satisfaction is not diminished when I learn that it is from Edmund Burke that the right hon. Gentleman has got his new phrase.

MR. ASQUITH: I said "Birmingham."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I did not know that the right hon. Gentleman was a student of that other school. My own defective hearing made me fall into an error for which I apologise. Really and truly I do not think that the right hon. Gentleman need have troubled his head about the phrase. What is the substance of the case as regards compensation? He advanced an argument to the House which I do not believe convinced any of the legal Members who listened to it, and I am quite certain nobody else. His argument was this. He says that the Courts have clearly laid it down that a man has no property whatever in his licence except for the year for which that licence is granted; and he treated with contempt a case brought forward by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Oxford in which a wholly different doctrine seemed to be laid down on this subject. I am informed by persons more learned in the law than myself that after the judgment in "Sharpe *v.* Wakefield" was given by the House of Lords there was another case heard in the High Court of Justice in which the Judges laid it down that a reversionary interest in a licence was not extinguished even at the end of thirty years. Now the right hon. Gentleman says all that is quite consistent with the House of Lords judgment in "Sharpe *v.* Wakefield." It is the laying down of the law which ought to govern magistrates in dealing with licences. When it is dealing with the death duties or compensation to be given for a licence, then it is dealing with the actual value of the licence in the open market. That is a distinction which will not touch any human being in this House or out of it. You allow a man to pay money for property, you tax a man on the property he has purchased, you allow the property to be divided among his heirs, you settle how it is to go, and you concede the possibility of a reversionary interest after thirty years. What is the use of saying that the magistrates may nevertheless in the exercise of their authority extinguish the licence absolutely, and that therefore the man has no right to a title?

MR. ASQUITH: Because they may.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not deny that they may. I say that by doing so they extinguish what the law admits to be property, and when that which the law admits to be property is extinguished without compensation a gross injustice is done. I venture to say that, though my exposition of this matter is incomparably inferior in learning and lucidity to that of the right hon. Gentleman, my broad statement will appeal to the House and to the country much more than the legal refinement which I and others are unable to comprehend.

The last criticism referred to what has been called "the time limit." The right hon. Gentleman and some of my hon. friends put a question to me as to the view we took of the time limit. In the first place, my right hon. friend near me was quite right in saying what is obvious that the time limit is not very congruous to the general scheme of our Bill. It does not fit in naturally and easily with the general plan of the Bill for the reason that it was not the plan we contemplated when we framed it. It is also true that it is essentially not a Second Reading, but a Committee question, and that it is in Committee, and Committee only, that this House can give a final decision upon it. But I think it is only fair to say that I have given a good deal of thought to the problem which has been presented by those who advocate the time limit, and I am unable to see that any cause we have at heart would gain by any application of that plan so far as I have heard. My right hon. friend the Member for Cambridge University appeared to think that we were conferring a freehold title by this Bill on the holders of existing licences. I think that my right hon. friend is quite wrong in that. He gave as an illustration of his view of the Bill that under it the holders of licences would receive precisely the same compensation, upon the same scale, and on the same plan, and for the same reasons, as the holders of the ante-1869 beerhouse licences, which I think was the last great temperance effort of the Party opposite—successful temperance effort I mean. I can assure my right hon. friend that is not so. There is no ground for supposing that the Inland Revenue or the Court of Appeal, which is over the Inland Revenue in this matter, would regard the right to sell alcholic liquor in one of these beerhouses which have a Parliamentary title as being worth the same number of years purchase as licences which held no such title. That difference will appear in compensation; and there is not the smallest ground for saying that we propose to treat the two as having precisely the same kind of tenure. If that be so what becomes of this idea that we are giving a freehold tenure to the present holders of licences? We are doing nothing of the kind. We are saying that these are to be compensated for on a tenure less in value than the freehold, and as such will receive compensation less in amount than if it were a freehold; and that we have elaborately provided for, and I believe successfully, by a sub-section in the second clause of the Bill.

I want to know what is going to be gained for any cause by an attempt to establish a time limit? We have not been told whether it is to be twenty years, or what; and there are different arguments applicable to different terms. Broadly speaking, what is intended is that the trade should pay an insurance for, say, twenty years, and after that the whole of their rights in their licences should be absolutely extinguished. Now that may seem at first sight plausible, but what would be the result? In the years preceding this twentieth year, from the fifteenth year onwards, every licence-holder would be afraid that at the end of twenty years he would be abolished without compensation. I presume it is probable that he would neglect his premises. He would certainly not spend capital on doing anything in the way of permanent improvements. So much for the years preceding the twentieth year. Then observe that, if the owner of the licence tries to insure against it, he will require to make an insurance in addition to the compulsory insurance. Of course, it is quite possible for every licence-holder to say, "I may be turned out under the Bill at the end of twenty years, but I shall insure against that." But you already compel him to insure at a very high rate for the twenty years, and you put on his back another insurance, which I presume he is to carry out voluntarily, which would preserve him from loss at the end of the twenty years. I do not imagine that many of them would do it. In any case, let us suppose you have reached the twentieth year. The theory is that you then have the trade absolutely within your grasp, and that the magistrates can without compensation, without notice, and without hardship to anybody, expel the licence-holder whenever it suits their convenience and their fancy so to do—[OPPOSITION cries of dissent] — then, whenever it is, in their view, to the public interest. The difference is quite immaterial to my argument. By the twentieth year you will have been expending, potentially at all events, if it is necessary, the sum annually of £1,200,000. For my part, I take a different view of the needs of the public from that of some temperance reformers. I believe that by that time you will probably have reduced the number of licences to an amount which no moderate temperance reformer would wish to alter. The result would probably be that in most cases the licence would go on, and the result of that would be that again these semi-legal rights — I think that was Mr. Bruce's phrase — would grow up; again the magistrates would be put into the old difficulty. [OPPOSITION cries of "No."] They will. That is exactly what will happen with the actual holders at the end of the twenty years. You may say that they might have insured; but gradually, human nature being what it is, these licences will again pass from hand to hand, again large sums will be paid for them, and again the existing state of things, which we all admit is unsatisfactory, will grow up, and again the magistrates will have, in certain cases, to decide between their duty to the public and the equities of the licence-holder. I do not believe that temperance will gain by that process. I believe temperance is losing under the existing state of things; and I contemplate with very great reluctance the restoration of that state of things, mitigated, no doubt, by this enormous expenditure of £30,000,000 or £40,000,000, but still capable of producing in a smaller degree all the old evils which we deplore.

I have come into collision with a great deal of opposition on both sides, but personally I am clearly of opinion that no trade, be it what it may, is likely to be best carried on under an uncertain tenure. Hon. Gentlemen opposite are so nervously anxious lest the publican should get a shilling more than he is absolutely entitled to [OPPOSITION cries of "The brewers"]—well, that somebody who owns a licence will get a shilling more than he is entitled to—that there is no hazard they will not run for the greater cause of temperance. I think that perfect folly. I cannot describe how serious I think the attitude of so-called temperance reformers is to the cause of temperance reform. The House was thinner when a speech was made by my hon. friend the Member for South Tyrone. We all know that he has taken an active part as a temperance propagandist for over thirty years; but I confess I was surprised that even that training should produce what seemed to me irrational violence against a measure which no man, in sober impartiality considering the question, can really doubt will hasten the extinction of licences. What did he say among other things? He incidentally observed that this was the most wicked proposal ever laid before the country; but he also went into an autobiographical sketch of his own efforts on the temperance question, and he told us that he bitterly regretted that, in regard to certain Bills which had been proposed, but not carried, in this House —Mr. Bruce's Bill, for instance, and the Bill of 1888—temperance reformers had not taken his advice and accepted those Bills. What is the advice he gives now? It is precisely the same kind of advice he quarrels with the temperance reformers about, and, if he has his way, it will lead to precisely the same result. What was Mr. Bruce's Bill? Mr. Bruce's Bill, it is quite true, gave no pecuniary compensation. It gave fixity of tenure for ten years. I say that a man who calls himself a temperance reformer and who is prepared to say that he prefers a Bill which is going to stereotype the existing state of things for ten years and rejects a Bill which will enable every quarter sessions throughout the country to borrow at once, on the security of this Bill, an immense sum of money for the extinction of licences, has surely lost all his sobriety of judgment. And when he describes the

Bill which would have stereotyped every existing licence for ten years as a Bill which ought to have been accepted, and says the Bill we are now considering is the most wicked proposal ever laid before the country, what are we to think of that man who poses as a moderate specimen of the temperance reformer?

I heard cries of protests from the other side when I said this Bill would diminish the number of licences. Can anybody look at the figures, before the sudden display of energy of a few brewster sessions last year, and doubt that? I believe the average diminution of licences under the existing system was less than 200—I think I am right in saying something between 100 and 200—for the whole country. Was that because the magistrates in brewster sessions and quarter sessions held the view that there was not a superfluity of licences? That cannot be so, I think; because if it were so should we have had this passionate defence of brewster sessions and of the magistrates from hon. Gentlemen opposite, to whom such exhibitions of charitable zeal in that particular cause must be very unfamiliar? I assume that these brewster sessions and quarter sessions were of opinion that they could not abolish more than this number throughout the country, because to do so would be a grave injustice to the licence-holders. There can be no alternative. Does not common sense suggest, then, that if that was the obstacle to a reduction of licences the way to remove that obstacle is to give those magistrates the power of conferring compensation? And does anybody whom I am addressing doubt that the application of £1,200,000 a year, or the capital sum which that represents, put in the hands of these magistrates can make the number of abolitions not 100 or 200, or even the 230 of which the right hon. Gentleman talked, but some number incomparably greater? If that argument, to which I have heard no answer in this debate, be true, what a responsibility is taken by those who, sincerely thinking that a diminution of licences is desirable, yet peddle and quarrel over the only practical scheme which I believe has ever been brought before the House for carrying it out. I can only account for it by thinking that, underneath the differences which have apparently divided us on this Bill, there are yet more profound differences of opinion. I believe that the temperance party in their hearts desire that no compensation should be given, and that they wish to abolish every public-house in the country. I think the first proposition is absurd, and I think the second proposition is iniquitous. We have had floods of oratory from the other side, though not from the other side alone; but has anyone given us what is the Liberal theory of compensation? Is there any theory of compensation on which hon. Gentlemen opposite are agreed or nearly agreed? There is none. Is there any agreement as to whether or not the drink traffic should be totally suppressed? There is no agreement. I listened, I confess, with profound disapproval to certain attacks made upon the licence-holders. My hon. friend the Member for Tyrone, and, I think, the hon. Baronet the Member for Camborne, said, "Talk of compensation to the publican! Who is to compensate the widow, who is to compensate the son and daughter who have all been ruined by the publican?"

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL: I said the trade. I never mentioned publican.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Well, the trade if you like, or the man who carries on the trade. Sir, these people are ruined by their gross and criminal self-indulgence. To suppose for an instant that the mass of the British working-men are poor, innocent, unfortunate people, tempted by a criminal trade to forget their duties, is an absurd supposition. The fault lies with the drunkard, with the man who cannot control his appetite. The fault lies with the man who, instead of that moderate, innocent, and even healthful consumption of alcoholic beverages—[Some OPPOSITION cries of "Oh"]—in which I am sure ninety-nine out of every 100 Members of this House do indulge—the fault lies with the condition of public opinion in the classes affected, and with the lack of manly self-control which is necessary to resist temptation. Sir, it is by appealing to these sentiments that you will make this great reform. Bills like this do something, but you will have to go far deeper than any Act of Parliament can go if you mean to carry out the great reform which we all hope may come. Do not let us despair of living, I will not say to see it come in its entirety, but to see it come in large measure. Look back at the history of the well-to-do class. See what their views of temperance and intemperance were three or four generations ago—the disgusting want of self-control which the lax social morality of the time permitted and even encouraged. We are all flesh and blood; we are all influenced by the same motives and dragged down by similar temptations; and my belief is that when you do get in all classes of the community the same kind of public opinion which happily now prevails among the richer class of the community in this country you will have done, not indeed everything, but more than any Act of Parliament can do to take away the stigma and reproach which justly attaches to our country. There are symptoms which induce me to believe that the change in the habits of the people, slower than we could wish, is yet real and great. Bills like this may help them, but what will not help them is the extravagant expression of teetotal views—statements, revolting to common sense, that the mere touch of alcohol is contaminating and wicked, and on the other side, the immoral transfer of the guilt of the man who drinks on to the shoulders of the man who has supplied him with drink. If temperance reformers would take these observations to heart, which I know they will not, if they would aid in building up on rational and moderate lines in every class of the community the kind of public opinion that now prevails among the well-to-do, then, Sir, I believe that more would be done than ever can be done by this House; although it surely is beneath our dignity, our sense of duty, our view of public policy that we should reject a Bill, not because it will not carry out the object for which it was introduced, but because, forsooth, you may persuade yourselves that this or that holder of a licence, this or that brewer, this or that man engaged in a trade which you hate may get a shilling more of his own money than perhaps you desire him to get. I hope the House will by an overwhelming majority allow us to proceed with this Bill in Committee.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.), who spoke amid continued cries of "Divide," and "Order" said he regretted the last note of the Prime Minister's Speech. He had expressed the opinion that drunkenness was entirely attributable to the drinking habits of the people and that it was not the business of Parliament to intervene. But the House of Commons would abolish one of its fundamental rights if it was admitted that it could not touch in any way the public life of the nation. There was no doubt as to the origin of the Bill, and, when they knew its genesis, it behoved them carefully to consider the effect of its provisions. He desired to approach its considerations from the standpoint of citizenship. As they knew, he placed the highest value on the temperance movement. That movement supplied many of their highest ideals, it also supplied the stimulus for progress in the direction of their attainment. But it was clear that as things were at present temperance was not a dominant factor in English political life, and they must be content to move step by step on the road of licensing reform.

Colonel SANDYS rose in his place and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put;" but Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER withheld his assent, and declined then to put that Question.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS, continuing, said none the less was it imperative that when such a Bill was brought forward they should resist it to the uttermost if they believed its provisions to be a hindrance to future reforms. Having commented upon the Prime Minister's ignorance of magisterial procedure, he pointed out that the possession of full discretionary powers by the licensing justices had been a most potent weapon in the past for securing administrative improvements. Dealing with the financial clauses of the Bill he declared his opinion that the scheme of compensation was unworkable, inequitable, and inadequate.

Mr. A. J. **Balfour** rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The House divided :— Ayes, 329; Noes, 224. (Division List No. 118.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Aird, Sir John
Allhusen, Augustus Hen. Eden
Allsopp, Hon. George
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt.Hn.HughO
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt.Hn.Sir H.
Austin, Sir John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A.J.(Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barry, Sir Francis T.(Windsor)
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Mich. Hicks
Beckett, Ernest William
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Boulnois, Edmund
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Lt.-Col.H.F(Middlesex
Bowles, T.Gibson(King's Lynn
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brown, Sir Alex. H. (Shropsh.)
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt.Hn.J.A.(Glasgow
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt, Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain,Rt Hn.J.A(Worc.
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Coghill, Douglas Harry

Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Rt.Hn.Sir John C. R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim,S.)
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies, Sir H. D. (Chatham)
Dewar,Sir T.R.(Tower Hamlets
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dimsdale, Rt.Hn.Sir Joseph C.
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hn. Sir John E.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt.Hn.Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants, W.
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, P. S. (Warwick, S.W.)
Fyler, John Arthur
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon, Hn.J.E.(Elgin&Nairn)
Gordon, Maj. E. (T'r Hamlets)
Gore, Hon. S.F.Ormsby-(Linc.)
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Green,Walford D.(Wednsebury
Greene, Henry D.(Shrewsbury)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble

Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gunter, Sir Robert
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hain, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton,RtHn LordG(Midd'x
Hamilton,Marq of(L'nd'nderry
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th)
Harris, Dr. Fredk. R. (Dulwich
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, A. Howard (Hanley)
Heath, James (Staffords., N.W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A.(Stafford, W.
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse,RtHn H(Somers't,E
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversham)
Howard, J.(Midd., Tottenham)
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hn. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Kimber, Henry
Knowles, Sir Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Jos. (Monmouth)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, J. Grant (Yorks., N.R.
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hon. W. (Bristol, S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee

Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J.(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis(Edinburgh, W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, RtHn.SirH.E(Wigt'n
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt.Hn.Sir Frederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Mitchell, William (Burnley)
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hn. J. Scott (Hants.)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Moore, William
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pease, Herb. Pike (Darlington)
Peel, Hn.Wm.Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.

Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, Hon. M.W.(Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt.Hn.Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rothschild, Hn. Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rucherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Sir H. S. (Limehouse)
Sandys, Lt.-Col. Thos. Myles
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Shaw-Stewart, Sir H.(Renfrew)
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford, East)
Smith, H C(North'mb.Tyneside
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Edward Jas.(Somerset

Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'd Univ
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col.Sir C.E.H (Sheff'ld
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt.Hn.Sir William H.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.-Col.A.C.E(Taunton
Welby, Sir Chas. G. E. (Notts.)
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H.(Ashton und.Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W.H.(Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt.Hn. E.R.(Bath
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Younger, William

Tellers for the Ayes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Ambrose, Robert
Asher, Alexander
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herb. Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Black, Alexander William
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.

Brigg, John
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William

Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan)
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice, Capt E.C(SAndrw'sBghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir F. H. (Maidstone)
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)

Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Field, William
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick
Griffith, Ellis J.
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Lewis V. (Rossendale)
Harcourt, RtHn SirW(Monm'th
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kilbride, Denis
Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leamy, Edmund
Leese, Sir Jos. F. (Accrington)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Logan, John William
Lough, Thomas

Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William
Mitchell, Edw. (Fermanagh, N.)
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Morley, Rt. Hn. John (Montrose
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newnes, Sir George
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Jas. (Roscommon, N.
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Palmer, Sir Chas. M. (Durham)
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roche, John
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter

Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R (Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, D. Alfred (Merthyr)
Thomas, J. A (Glamorgan, Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Tillet, Louis John
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Wallace, Robert
Walton, J. Lawson (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, Jn. Cathcart (Orkney)
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh., N.)
Wood, James
Woodhouse, Sir J. T (Huddersf'd
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M'Arthur.

Question put accordingly, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

The House divided:—Ayes, 353; Noes, 196. (Division List No. 119.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Aird, Sir John
Allhusen, Augustus Henry Eden
Allsopp, Hon. George
Ambrose, Robert
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O

Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H
Austin, Sir John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred

Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Mich. Hicks

Beckett, Ernest William
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Bill, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Boland, John
Bond, Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Boulnois, Edmund
Bousfield, William Robert
Bowles, Lt.-Col. H. F (Middlesex
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brown, Sir Alex. H. (Shropsh.)
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Burke, E. Haviland
Butcher, John George
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Carlile, William Walter
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A (Worc.
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Coghill, Doulgas Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colomb, Rt. Hn. Sir John C. R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Crean, Eugene
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cullinan, J.
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies Sir H. D. (Chatham)
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dewar, Sir T. R (Tower Hamlets
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dimsdale, Rt. Hn. Sir Joseph C.
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon
Doogan, P. C.
Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir John E
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants., W.
Fardell, Sir T. George
Field, William
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, P. S. (Warwick, S. W.)
Fyler, John Arthur
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Gordon, Maj. E. (T'r Hamlets)
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Green, Walford D. (Wednesbury
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Grenfell, William Henry
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Gunter, Sir Robert
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Hall, Edward Marshall
Halsey, Rt. Hon. Thomas F.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hamilton, Rt Hn. Lord G (Midd'x
Hamilton, Marq of (L'nd'nderry
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th
Harris, Dr. Fredk. R. (Dulwich
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hayden, John Patrick
Heath, A. Howard (Hanley)
Heath, James (Staffords., N.W.
Heaton, John Henniker
Helder, Augustus
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Rt Hn H (Somerset, E
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversham
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. Arthur Fred.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Kilbride, Denis
Kimber, Henry
Knowles, Sir Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Jos. (Monmouth)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, J. Grant (Yorks., N.R.
Leamy, Edmund
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hon. W. (Bristol, S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Francis William
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M‘Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M‘Hugh, Patrick A
M‘Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh, W
M‘Kean, John
M‘Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
M‘Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H. E (Wigt'n
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.
M‘Ilvain, Thomas
Mitchell, William (Burnley)
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hn. J. Scott (Hants.)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Mooney, John J.
Moore, William
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Nicholson, William Graham
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)

O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow,W.
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Jas. (Roscommon, N.)
O'Malley, William
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parker, Sir Gilbert
Pease, Herb. Pike (Darlington)
Peel, Hn.Wm.Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Pym, C. Guy
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, R. F.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, Hon. M.W.(Stalybridge
Ritchie, Rt.Hn.Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Robinson, Brooke
Roche, John
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye

Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rothschild, Hn. Lionel Walter
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Sir H. S. (Limehouse)
Sandys, Lt.-Col. Thos. Myles
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford, East)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Edward Jas.(Somerset
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Sullivan, Donal
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.

Tuff, Charles
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col.SirC.E.H.(Sheff'ld
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt.Hn.Sir WilliamH.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.-Col.A.C.E(Taunton
Welby, Sir Chas. G. E. (Notts.)
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon-
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whiteley, H.(Ashton und.Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wilson-Todd, Sir W.H.(Yorks.)
Wodehouse, Rt.Hn. E.R.(Bath
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Young, Samuel
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland - Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Asher, Alexander
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herb. Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Black, Alexander William
Blake, Edward
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Brigg, John
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)

Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan)
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Ellice,Capt. E.C(SAndrw'sBghs
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir F. H. (Maidstone)
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Foster, Sir Mich. (Lond. Univ.
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Captain

Furness, Sir Christopher
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Hain, Edward
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Lewis V.(Rossendale
Harcourt,RtHnSir W(Monm'th
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Harwood, George
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol,E.)
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones,William (Carnarvonshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael

Labouchere, Henry
Lambert, George
Langley, Batty
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Jos. F. (Accrington)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Logan, John William
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William
Mitchell, Edw. (Fermanagh, N.)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Morley, Rt. Hn. John (Montrose
Moss, Samuel
Moulton, John Fletcher
Newnes, Sir George
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Palmer, Sir Chas. M. (Durham)
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, John Wynford
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, Robert John
Priestley, Arthur
Rea, Russell
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Rickett, J. Compton
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Shaw-Stewart, Sir H. (Renfrew)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyneside
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R (Northants
Strachey, Sir Edward
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, .
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, D. Alfred (Merthyr)
Thomas, J. A (Glamorgan, Gower
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.)
Tillet, Louis John
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Wallace, Robert
Walton, J. Lawson (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, Jn. Cathcart (Orkney)
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh., N.
Wood, James
Woodhouse, Sir J. T (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. William M'Arthur.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed for Monday, 6th June.

EVENING SITTING.

PAYMENT OF MEMBERS AND RETURNING OFFICERS' EXPENSES.

MR. ARTHUR HENDERSON (Durham, Barnard Castle) said the Resolution he desired to submit to the consideration of the House dealt with two anomalies in our electoral system which imposed disabilities upon a large section of the community and which were inconsistent with true representative government. The first of these was the charges imposed on Parliamentary candidates by the returning officers. The total expenditure in the last general election for 1,103 candidates in the United Kingdom was £777,429 0s. 1d., and of this amount no less than £150,278 10s. 11d. was for returning officers' charges. In England and Wales 825 candidates paid £119,041 5s. 5d; in Scotland 141 candidates paid £19,396 9s. 4d., and in Ireland 137 candidates paid £11,840 16s. 2d. In the case of England and Wales the total charge was made of the following items—

> "Presiding officers, clerks and counters, £56,675 6s. 11d. Polling places, £24,540 17s. 1d. Professional assistance, £19,927 17s. 5½d. Ballot boxes, ballot papers, dies and advertising, £15,544. Publishing notices and making return to the Clerk of the Crown, £10,048 15s. 10½d. Travelling expenses and carriage of ballot boxes, £10,452 1s. 6d. Issuing nomination papers, £2,046 19s 5d. All other expenses, £7,124 5s. 11d.

In the Romford Division the candidates paid between them £874 17s. 1d.; in the case of five constituencies the candidates paid between them over £700; in ten they paid over £600; in eighteen over £550; in twenty-six over £500; in thirty-eight over £450; in thirty-three over £400. One hundred and thirty-two candidates in England and Wales paid over £400. One labour candidate paid half of £740. The hon. Member for the Wansbeck Division paid half of £665. And let it be remembered all this was paid for creating the necessary election machinery for the convenience of the public. During recent years the local authorities had rightly had great regard for the convenience of the electors and had given greater facilities. New polling places had been made and consequently more returning officers and clerks were necessary, each of whom meant another fine upon the candidate. The Legislature had already admitted the justice of making these charges a claim upon the public funds, as would be seen from local elections, the charges for which were provided out of the local funds. He contended that charges of Parliamentary elections should come upon the public funds, and expressed the opinion that their retention as a fine upon the candidates was altogether indefensible.

The second point dealt with by the Resolution, the payment of Members, was, he was quite aware, not so popular with some sections of the House as the first, but a strong case could be made out in support of the principle. In the first place, this House should be representative of every section of the community. Less than that was inconsistent with true self-government. What was the position to-day? The majority of the House belonged to a section of the people which was not numerically the strongest. The late Lord Salisbury, speaking on the Shop Hours Bill, had said—

> "This is one of the cases in which the two Houses of Parliament occupy a somewhat difficult position. They are asked to legislate as to matters affecting the personal happiness and well-being of a very large number of persons—a very large class to which, with scarcely an exception, the Members of the two Houses do not themselves belong. It is, therefore, very difficult for them to know how such a measure would affect the comfort of the classes concerned."

This difficulty did not exist with the brewing interest, with its fifty representatives in this House, to say nothing of those indirectly interested whom they had seen clustering like bees on the Benches opposite, waiting to vote in their own interest; it did not exist with the manufacturing classes, who had 160 representatives; or with the law with their 140; or with the landed interest with their 100 representatives in this House. It was when they came to the smaller commercial interests and the working classes that they found the smallest representation. This was not the result of deliberate selection from an unlimited area. It was the inevitable outcome of the barriers and restrictions which obtained. He thought they might fairly ask that that state of things should be altered. Not only should the area of supply be larger, but those elected should be not only the representatives of the constituencies, but the servants of the nation. The right hon. Member for West Birmingham once said—

> "You pay Ministers of the Crown, and I cannot understand why Members of Parliament should be the only people to work for nothing."

If Members of Parliament were paid it is possible they would feel a higher responsibility to those who employed them; they would then be the representatives of the people in the fullest and most complete sense. Both sides of the House professed to have an educational policy which would open the door of the University to the child of the poorest parents in the country. Surely with such a policy as that, it was inconsistent to close the door of this House against the man, the product it might be of this University training and democratic progress in education. This education policy with which both sides of the House agreed was not given to the child, which had the capacity to take advantage of it, for its own sake. It was given in the hope that at some time or other the child would be able to give a return to the State whose money had brought him to that high state of proficiency. That being so, the logical corollary was that the door of this House should be open as wide as possible.

In making the request that the principle of payment of Members should be adopted, they only asked that this country should come into line with nearly all the countries of the world having constitutional government. With one exception the Continental nations had come into line, and were paying their representatives. Nearly every one of our Colonies had adopted the same principle, and in most cases not only paid members of the Legislature salaries, but made allowances for house-rent and travelling expenses as well, and he had yet to learn that that policy was working in any but a satisfactory manner. But it was not necessary to go so far for a precedent. In this country we were and had been for years paying the Ministers of the Crown, and he had always felt that if a Gentleman, after giving many years to the service of this House got a substantial salary as a Minister, and a perpetual reward in the shape of a pension, when his Party went out of office, for services rendered in the House, a good case could be made out for the payment of a moderate stipend to each Parliamentary representative for the work that he did. They were told that if once they admitted the principle of payment of Members there would be the danger of professional politicians entering the House. Why the House was full of them already. They were also told that if the professional politician entered this House its *status* would be lowered. If it were not irreverent, he would say, God help them if they got any lower than at present. He believed the payment of Members would have the directly opposite effect. If Members received a stipend and they could make each Member take out his "board" or ticket when he entered the House and put it in when he had finished his day's work, there would be no room for the professional politician; they would have to be workers and put in their time, and their constituents would see that they put in an honest day's work for an honest day's pay. In conclusion, he asked that the principles of the Resolutions should be accepted, not for the purpose of bestowing a measure of patronage upon one section of the people, not as an expression of sympathy with labour representation, but as an evidence that the right of free and unrestricted choice was to be given to the people for the selection of their Parliamentary representation. He begged to move the Resolution standing in his name.

*MR. FENWICK (Northumberland, Wansbeck) said that in seconding the Motion of the hon. Member he wished to recall the history of this movement since the passing of the last Reform Act. In 1886, shortly after he entered the House, a Bill was promoted by the hon. and learned Member for North Louth to reduce the official cost of elections so far as Ireland was concerned. His hon. friend was fortunate enough not only to secure a Second Reading but to put it through the other stages in the House. While the Bill was in Committee they succeeded in carrying an Amendment to relieve Parliamentary candidates in Ireland, successful or unsuccessful, of all official costs. The Bill went to another place, the Members of which were unlike the Members of this House in that they had not to face constituents or bear the burden of the cost of election. That Amendment was struck out of the Bill, and before this House had an opportunity of reconsidering the House of Lords Amendment, a dissolution took place, and consequently the Bill fell through. In 1883 he called the attention of the House by Resolution to this question, and invited hon. Members to revert to what was the constitutional practice in this country of paying Members for their services in Parliament. On that occasion his Resolution was supported by 135 votes in a House consisting of 327 Members. That, to him, was a very satisfactory result, considering that on a previous occasion, when the question was brought before the House by the late Mr. P. A. Taylor, the Member for Leicester, only twenty-six Members followed him into the division lobby. Four years later he raised the question again, when the Motion was supported by 162 in a House of 189 Members. In the following session his hon. friend Mr. W. Allen, late Member for Newcastle-under-Lyne took charge of the Motion, and on that occasion he was successful in obtaining a majority of forty-seven in a very full House of 505 Members. In 1895 the question was again raised, and the Resolution was passed by a majority of eighteen. There the question stood until last session, when the Motion of the hon. Member for Woolwich fell through as they were unable to take a division under the Twelve O'clock Rule. From this review, hon. Members would see that public opinion in reference to this question had been gradually growing from time to time, as the votes of Members clearly indicated.

What had always been the object which Parliament had in view when it undertook to broaden the franchise? The object both in the Reform Bill of 1832 and that of 1867 was to broaden the basis of the Constitution, and to secure a more full and complete representation of the people in the House of Commons. It was intended to make this House more responsive to the opinion of the people of the country, and to give the people more control over Parliament. No one would venture to deny the justice of the abstract principle that those to whom the franchise had been given were entitled to the fullest, freest, and most complete liberty of choice of those who were going to represent them in this House. Indeed, it seemed to him that the broadening of the franchise without affording the means at the same time of making a free choice or selection of Parliamentary candidates was a mere mockery and delusion to the electors. The abstract principle was beyond gainsay; but he contended that under our present constitutional practice that full liberty of choice was denied the electors. He would like to cite one or two authorities on this point—

"Liberty of choice,"

Mr. Cohen told the men of Newcastle—

"for all, from all, is little better than a mockery if the roll of candidates is limited by the imposition of conditions that one class only can comply with. What more right has a country to the unremunerative labour of those who work by the intellect than to the product of the rest of the community? Pay all election expenses out of the rates, and Members of Parliament out of the taxes. Then, and not till then, will there be a Government freely assented to by all, and working for all."

His hon. friend the Member for Barnard Castle Division had called the attention of the House to the enormous expense which had to be borne by every candidate on both sides of the House. He himself had had to run the gauntlet of five contested elections since 1885. Five-sixths of the constituency which he had the honour to represent consisted of working men, and the official expenses in these contests amounted to £1,514. That money had to come out of the pockets of the working men. He maintained that that was a cost which Parliamentary candidates ought not to bear. He remembered that at the first election after the last Reform Bill, in the county of Northumberland every candidate had to pay for the ballot boxes, in many cases more than their real value, and six months afterwards they were charged again for those same ballot boxes. He held that it was a monstrous thing that men who gave their time to the public interests should be subjected to fleecing such as that, for it was nothing short of fleecing. At the election of local authorities, candidates did not have to bear the official costs of the election. In 1894 there was a debate in this House on the question, and his right hon. friend the Member for Montrose Burghs then said—

"The proposal before us will not only open the door of the House to workmen, but will facilitate the entrance of men of moderate means of all classes. The easier it becomes for Members to enter this House on their merits, and on the strength of the principles which they profess, the more lofty will become the authority of Parliament, and the greater the chance of its counsels being prudent and wise."

He thoroughly agreed with the sentiment therein expressed. Speaking in that same debate, the late Lord Randolph Churchill made use of the following language—

"It was the greatest object the State could achieve to get a complete representation of all classes in Parliament, whether they were labour representatives, representatives of the middle classes, representatives of literature, or science, or art, or law, or even of the landed interest; and therefore it was right that to achieve that end there should be a contribution from the Consolidated Fund."

No one, let him say, in any previous debate on this subject had ventured to question its justice.

Now, as to the second part of the Resolution, which dealt with the question of the payment of Members. He knew that it would probably meet with less favour on the part of hon. Members, particularly those on the other side of the House, but he ventured to say that in all previous debates the opponents of this Resolution had carefully refrained from attacking the principle and had approached the consideration of the matter entirely from the point of view of expediency. He should doubt also whether anyone who spoke that evening on behalf of the Government would put forward any other argument against the proposal than the argument of expediency. That was an argument he could understand in the depleted state of the Exchequer at this moment; but he hoped, if the Government intended to vote against the Resolution, and particularly the last part of it, they would turn their attention to the principle involved, and not ride off on the argument of expediency. When he raised the question in 1888 the right hon. Member for Cambridge University, who took part in the debate, was careful to say that he did not oppose the principle of paying Members. "He was not sure," said the right hon. Gentleman, "that the day might not come when it might be expedient to pay Members of Parliament." Why pay Members of Parliament, it was said, when they could obtain men in abundance who were willing to serve their country gratuitously? Well, that might appeal to some hon. Members opposite, but it did not seem to him altogether a conclusive and satisfactory answer to his contention. If this House was simply to be open to men who had made their fortunes in business, or in some profession, on the Stock Exchange, or it might be on the Turf, then he contended that that was not a satisfactory arrangement. Entrance to this House ought to be easy to the humblest subject in His Majesty's dominions. His hon. friend referred to a statement made by the late Colonal Secretary. He would refer to an article written by the right hon. Member for West Birmingham, which appeared in the *Nineteenth Century*, in which he said—

> "There is no conclusive reason why Members should not be paid like members of the Government, and we know that this is the practice in almost every other representative Legislature."

Now it was sometimes said in reply to their contention that the principle of representation in this House was based on gratuitous service. That was not so. Hon. Members who had given any consideration to this question knew perfectly well that there was such a thing as political pensions. On this point he wished to make himself perfectly clear. He was not arguing against the practice itself. It was sufficient for his argument that the practice of paying men for political services existed at the present moment. It was said that those gentleman in receipt of political pensions had withdrawn themselves from commercial pursuits, and many other opportunities of earning money, and had placed their services absolutely at the control of the public. But was there a single Member in the House who did not stand in the same position? Again, it was said that in order to obtain a political pension, a man must have held a high position; but, while having the advantage of holding high office, he was in receipt of a salary, and in that respect he was in a better position than a private Member. Sir George Trevelyan said in the House of Commons that—

> "To grant political pensions, and to refuse to pay Members of Parliament in the same circumstances as the recipients of political pensions, was the *ne plus ultra* of anomaly."

He agreed thoroughly with Sir George Trevelyan in that respect. His hon. friend referred to the practice in the Colonies. No one would declare, so far as the Colonies were concerned, that this principle had worked other than with beneficial results. He would wait with some degree of interest to hear that contention challenged. In that connection he wished to refer to a speech delivered in 1897 in Dublin by the right hon. G. C. Kingston, at that time Prime Minister of South Australia. In reply to an address presented to him by the Dublin Trades Council, who thanked him for his work on behalf of labour in South Australia, Mr. Kingston stated that there was no reform to which he attached greater importance than the payment of Members, and he added that, however strong and liberal a franchise might be, without that reform the representation of the people would be to a great extent confined to the leisured classes. He also said that it was ridiculous that when the principle of payment applied from the Queen down to the labourer it should be denied as regarded men who did good work in public affairs. That was the principle that applied in the Colonies, and which had worked with great advantage to all concerned, and he ventured to say that until that principle was conceded in this country that the franchise, however broad it might be, would be little better than a mockery and a sham. Why should the industrial classes alone have to fine themselves in order to obtain representation in this House. It might be said that if Members of Parliament were paid there would be no stopping place; and that members of county councils, district councils, and parish councils would also have to be paid. That seemed to him to be begging the question. There was no membership of any public authority outside this House which compelled a man for six months to live away from his home. The duties of a member of a county council, a district council, or a parish council were not incompatible with the duties of his profession or occupation. But representation in this House compelled a Member to withdraw himself from his home for six months in the year. Therefore there was no analogy between representation in this House and representation as a member of a local authority. The justice of their claim was absolutely established, and he sincerely hoped that the day was not far distant when it would become an established fact. He begged to second the Motion.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable and expedient that, in order to give Constituencies a full and free choice in the selection of Parliamentary Candidates, the charges now made by the Returning Officer to the Candidates should be chargeable to public funds, and that all Members of the House of Commons should receive from theState a reasonable stipend during their Parliamentary life."—(*Mr. Arthur Henderson.*)

*MR. MALCOLM (Suffolk, Stowmarket) said that he had listened with pleasure to the moderate speeches which had been delivered by the hon. Gentlemen who moved and seconded the Motion, although the hon. Gentleman who moved the Motion was not moderate towards the end of his speech. But that was because the subject on which he was speaking was very close to his heart. It was a little unfortunate that the subject should be brought before the House of Commons at the present time when public money was very short. In the last three or four weeks private Members who were in a position of great freedom and no responsibility had introduced measures and Resolutions which if carried into effect, but which he hoped they would not be for the sake of the taxpayer, would involve a total expenditure of something like £10,000,000 next year. He was sorry that the two hon. Gentlemen who had spoken had not told the House what the total of the expenditure they proposed would be, especially at a time when the taxpayer was being almost rated out of existence. From the point of view of expediency it was really intolerable that this burden should be put on the shoulders of the people, unless it could be shown that at present Parliament did its work badly and inefficiently. Neither of the two hon. Gentlemen who had spoken had stated that Parliament did its work inefficiently. They only suggested that there should be more paid Members or all paid Members without reference to the efficiency of the work which was done. Essentially he was in agreement with parts of the substance of the Resolution. He was of opinion that Parliament should be recruited from all classes of the community and that the country should have what had been happily called freedom of choice, but not only from amongst representatives of the class which demanded payment of Members. He would suggest a simpler way of securing the object at which the Resolution aimed and which he thought would have the approval of every hon. Member in the House. Not only should the returning officers' expenses be paid by the State, but the legal expenditure connected with an election should be reduced all over the country. It was really intolerable that even at an uncontested by-election a Member should be charged as he now was. Further, every Gentleman who was elected to the House of Commons seemed to be regarded as the legitimate prey of every club and institution, *bona fide* or bogus, in his constituency. If that tradition could be broken down, a great deal more freedom of choice would exist among the subjects of the King, in connection with representation in Parliament. At present, a Member's subscription list appeared to increase rather than to diminish. The boroughs which were now within the reach of poor men to sit for would very likely be redistributed out of existence if the Bill on which the Prime Minister cast such a favouring eye came into existence.

The hon.Gentleman the Member for the Barnard Castle Division in his somewhat aggressive concluding remarks said that the House of Commons would probably not support the Motion because it objected to professional politicians, and he added that he thought the House objected to the Labour Members. When, however, the hon. Gentleman had been a Member of the House for a longer period he would recognise that the Labour Members were respected by all Parties. The professional politician was, however, quite another matter. Hon. Gentlemen who disagreed with the Resolution did not want politics in this country to become a trade by which men made their living. One reason was, that a man who made a profession of politics would have no occupation if he were turned out of Parliament. He had paid a certain amount of attention to the Parliaments of Europe and he did not think that the House of Commons had anything to learn from them. The Mother of Parliaments was in the proud position of having taught them everything, and he should be extremely sorry to see in the House of Commons the scenes which he had seen in almost every Parliament in Europe.

Another reason why he objected to payment of Members was that it would entail undivided attention to the work of Parliament; and, therefore, deprive Parliament of the valuable assistance of professional men and experts, not only on the floor of the House, but where better work was done, in Committees upstairs. Such men could not attend to their professional work and also occupy the position of paid Members. He thought, also, it was rather hard that the minority in a division should have to pay for the representative of the majority. When one man paid the piper it was easy to settle who was to call the tune; but when both parties paid the piper it was difficult to know who was to call the tune. It appeared to him ridiculous that a Liberal minority should have to assist in paying for the return of a Tory representative; a recrudescence of passive resistance would be inevitable; though, to be sure, it would not matter so much if the money were to be paid out of taxes, but if it were to be paid out of rates that would be another matter. He thought in the public service some private sacrifice was demanded all round. Even on the Treasury Bench many Members lost the positions which they had earned in their professions, and did not receive the equivalent in the salaries. It was true that a few ex-Ministers received pensions, but it was a mistaken view that all ex-members of a Government were pensioned. When ex-members of an Administration returned to their professions they found the greatest difficulty in getting back their practice. It was evident that public service demanded private sacrifice, and that was shown by the two Front Benches. A pecuniary sacrifice was also expected from hon. Members who sat behind the Front Benches. In the case of the Labour Members that sacrifice was surmounted by the efforts of men who wished to be represented by Labour Members. But he knew of many cases where a Member who was not a Labour Member had made great pecuniary sacrifices and had not received anything in return. Such men were not confined to either side of the House. The gain to the nation was considerable in getting public service without payment; and he thought that the personal freedom and independence thus secured by free service more than outweighed the personal inconvenience of individuals. For these reasons, although he should press on every occasion for the reduction of electoral expenditure, he thought that no case had been made out for the Resolution; and that the House of Commons would get better and more efficient work where it was voluntarily given.

SIR BRAMPTON GURDON (Norfolk, N.) said he was honestly convinced that they would never get the representatives they wanted, they would never get rid of the militarism which had harmed the country so much, and they would never reduce the expenditure which had weighed them down so much, until they got a stronger Labour Party in the House. He was sorry to say county councils were suffering from the same difficulty and that the poor men were being elbowed out of these authorities because they could not afford the time and expense entailed. It was no use, however, passing Resolutions of this kind unless they purified themselves and their constituencies, and he thought he could speak in this sense because he had the good fortune to represent a constituency which was not at all greedy.

His subscription list was very small, and he had no salary to pay to a man going about the constituency doing harm. But if he were a millionaire instead of being a younger son, he would not spend a halfpenny more than he did now. He should like to see everyone in the House a good hard-working man in his own profession; but it was no use voting a poor man a salary of £200 a year—he supposed it would not be more—if he were expected to spend £500 or £600 a year in subscriptions, and it was no use for the State to pay the sheriff's expenses if candidates were to pay for printing, stationery, etc., and keeping up registration. There was an excellent Bill introduced in 1893, but it was stopped by the greed of the agents. He objected to paying salaries of all kinds, and he would do away with all unions, leagues, associations, and all the rest of them. He knew of a case in which a borough got rid of a distinguished man of great ability because he did not spend enough in the constituency, and got a richer man; and he recalled an incident relative to his own first election. An elector said to him, not knowing who he was, "We want a man with £80,000 a year, and not one like Gurdon, who has not halfpenny in the world." Neither statement was quite true, but his opponent did not contradict them until he got in, and then he said he was worse off than he (Sir William) was. The most satisfactory election in which he took part was one in which the Liberal Association, of which he was president, paid the candidate's election expenses. They had one of the best Members he had known. He should support the Resolution, believing they would never get a perfect Bill until they returned the best men, irrespective of the purse.

Mr. RANDLES (Cumberland, Cockermouth) said the question divided itself into two parts. It was one thing to make it inexpensive for Members to get into the House, and another thing to pay Members for sitting there. His own sympathies were in the direction of making it inexpensive, so that a candidate should not be harassed by registration expenses, returning officers' fees and other liabilities, but that he should be able to make it an advantage to himself to become a Member and make that position to some extent a means of livelihood would be introducing an element which was altogether beside the question. He thought it was a great drawback to any class, especially the working class, that they should be debarred from a representation which was their right. They should be represented by men in their own class. That had been attained to some extent by their own good sense and judgment, which had done much, if not all, that was necessary to solve the difficulty. It was extremely likely that they would see more Labour Members in that House. The working classes had themselves solved the difficulty by subjecting themselves to a certain amount of self-sacrifice, in order to have Parliamentary representation, and that was very commendable. They had secured that end by submitting to a system of contributions. If there were no registration charges and no returning officers' fees men with a very small wage, and indifferent sort of men, might endeavour to make a living by standing for Parliament, and so the quality and character of working-class representation in that House would suffer. At present there was a process of selection by which they got excellent working-class representatives, but if it were possible to enter Parliament without charges they might perhaps have representatives who might assume to represent the working classes, but who were not fairly representative, and so split up the voting power which had returned suitable Members. It was very unfair that a man who had been elected to that House should be bound to defend his seat owing to some trivial objection and should have to fight his election over again at very serious cost. That was his own experience. He successfully resisted a petition, which he thought was a very wicked one, and notwithstanding that his election was declared to have been obtained quite cleanly, and he was acquitted of all blame and obtained costs against the other side, he found it a very expensive business and was practically penalised for his success. He would say nothing against petitions which were successful or had some reasonable chance of success. So far as the Resolution went in the direction of reducing the costs and throwing them on the taxpayers, he was in entire sympathy with it, but he could not agree with that part which would conduce to men looking upon membership of the House as a means of living, and promoting interests other than those of the State. They had never found that a soldier fought better in the field because his pay was higher, or that the State was better served in any Department by men whose sole idea was remuneration.

MR. HAVILAND BURKE (King's County, Tullamore) said they had been told that a seat in the House of Commons was a privilege worth paying for. Might it not be said in the same sense that a seat in the Cabinet was also a privilege worth paying for. He was totally unable to discriminate between the high moral dignity which accepted so many thousands a year for holding office in the Ministry, and the sordid motives which asked for a mere stipend for serving the country faithfully and regularly as an ordinary Member of the House. Where did the corruption of the Cabinet Minister or the grasping avarice of the private Members come in? They would be more likely to have a lucid debate on the question if such insulting comparisons were dropped. After all, this was a question which had been decided in the affirmative in every country in the world. Were they to be told that the morale of the Canadian Parliament was lower than that of the British House of Commons? Were they to be told that the Chamber of Deputies and the Senate in Paris were morally or judicially degraded because the Members had a modest stipend, with the right to travel free on the State railways. They had heard a good deal about corruption——

MR. MALCOLM: Is the hon. Gentleman dealing with imaginary arguments, or something that has been said?

MR. HAVILAND BURKE said he was going on a line of his own. They had had it inferred that the payment of Members would induce a competition for seats in the House by Members whose only object would be to draw a salary and to earn a livelihood which they could not get elsewhere; that it would encourage corrupt adventurers and ignorant politicians. Something, too, had to be said about "nursing constituencies," but the old form of corruption and bribery, under which a pocket borough was sold in the open market, and a voter got a price down for his vote, was better and more manly than the present system which so widely prevailed of the constituency sponging upon the representative and compelling him to contribute to the local church and chapel, its cattle and flower shows and sports. That was in his mind a most insidious and shameless form of corruption. The hon. Member for Stowmarket spoke very pathetically about professional politicians abroad, but he would back the House of Commons against any foreign Parliament for disgraceful scenes, as witness the scene that occurred in 1893, when there was a free fight on the floor of the House, and when false teeth and scarf pins were scattered about. Nothing so bad had ever been seen in the French Chamber. They had been told furthermore that it would be an injustice to the minority that a tax for this purpose should be imposed by the majority, but were not minorities being taxed every day at the will of the majority? The hon. Member for Stowmarket wept salt tears over the sacrifices of men belonging to the legal profession. Why it was enough to make a humble private Member like himself hunger for the fleshpots of Egypt. It was really too great a demand on human credulity to ask them to believe that legal luminaries sacrificed anything by taking office under the Government. There were men in the House to-day who avowedly were supported by funds derived from public organisations, and these men occupied a perfectly honourable and above-board position, but if the present system was continued Members might be maintained, not out of funds publicly collected, but by wealthy trusts, corporations, and individuals for the maintenance of certain interests. On these grounds he thought the Motion was one that should be supported. The amount of the stipend was not worth mentioning. It need be only sufficient to enable a man to devote his whole time to the work of that House without prejudice to his actual personal interest. Personally, he took small account of the taunt about professional politicians. As a matter of fact, politics were a profession, and they were becoming more professional every year. Everybody with the smallest smattering of

Parliamentary knowledge and experience was aware that during the last twenty or twenty-five years the work in this House had so increased that it was rapidly becoming impossible for a man to discharge his duty to his constituents unless he was prepared to devote to it a fair average amount of time and to put in a fair average attendance. On these grounds he should support the Motion.

SIR CARNE RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford) said that he had the greatest sympathy with the proposal of the hon. Member, but he did not think that his plan would work. His own experience of eighteen years was that as all roads led to Rome so all charges came eventually on agricultural land. If Members of Parliament were paid, then they would have to pay county, borough, and parish councillors, so that eventually everyone would be walking about with a salary paid for by other people, and the result would be that everybody would be ruined. The mover of the Resolution was on considerably firmer ground in regard to the payment of returning officers' expenses. He remembered some time ago that after contesting an election with Mr. W. H. Wills, a former Member of this House, it was borne in upon him that the returning officers' expenses were more exorbitant than usual, and he went to law over them. He succeeded in getting 200 guineas knocked off the bill, and the learned Judge made certain remarks of a vitriolic character with reference to returning officers. The hon. Member opposite would probably find that that was the line of least resistance. As to subscription lists, they were precisely what Members chose to make them, and no more. Politically, payment of Members' expenses might not always be a good card to play. In a certain election in the West of England a candidate took that line, and at all his meetings urged with great force and vigour that his constituents should pay the expenses now generally borne by the Member. Nothing much was said against it until the eve of the poll, when an immoral opposition brought out a poster to this effect—

> "Loans for Ireland; subscriptions for the Armenians; nothing for us; and £1 a day for himself! Good old——!"

The result was that that candidate found himself at the bottom of the poll.

Mr. Haviland Burke.

SIR EDWARD GREY (Northumberland, Berwick) said that the Motion before the House was not a new one. It had often been before the House, and it did not produce much new argument for or against. The objections to the Motion were two. One was the material one, on the ground of expediency; and the other was what he considered the sentimental one, on the ground of principle. As to the objection on the ground of expediency, everyone admitted its force at the present moment. The present moment was not one for advocating an increase on the public charges; but, devoted as they might be to economy, even the most devoted thought that they needed increased expenditure in some directions, and there was no more hollow part than to play the spendthrift in millions and then to try to establish a reputation for economy by holding up one's hands in horror over an increase in thousands. He believed that in some departments of the public expenditure they might save in millions; but there were others, such as education and the department now under consideration, in which he thought it was justifiable in the interests of efficiency and economy to advocate a moderate increase. He therefore put the argument of expediency on one side. As to the returning officers' expenses, he understood that the proposal found favour on both sides of the House to a certain extent. Everybody admitted that the expenses were excessive; and the hon. and gallant Member for the Chelmsford Division had given a very encouraging illustration of how they might be reduced. He had not, however, stated whether his legal costs on that occasion were borne by the returning officer, nor could he guarantee that everybody who followed his example would be equally successful. What the supporters of this Resolution held was that where they had a general excess in costs they would never get it corrected except by making it to the public interest to see that the expenses were kept down, and much as they might admire the sporadic efforts of private individuals like the hon. Member for the Chelmsford Division, they must feel that the only way of getting those costs reduced was by making the public feel that they had an interest in keeping them down—that was, by putting them on the public funds. At present, they were to a certain extent met out of Party funds. Nobody but the initiated, of whom he was not one, and probably none but the initiated in the Party which had been in power for the greater part of the last eighteen years, had a thorough expert knowledge of how those funds were raised, maintained, and distributed, or of the considerations on which they were subscribed. He was convinced, at any rate, that it was not worthy of the dignity or the reputation of political life in this country that expenditure in the public interest, such as the expenses of the returning officers, should be defrayed out of privately subscribed Party funds. Where, on the other hand, they were not met out of Party funds, these expenses deliberately penalised a candidate, and were a direct bar to the entrance of poor men into the House of Commons. The returning officers' expenses were imposed by the State, and ought to be borne out of public funds.

In regard to the payment of Members, he could add very little to what his hon. friend the Member for Wansbeck had said, either in logic or in principle. The House had extended the franchise widely. It had done much in theory—though still more remained to be done in practice—to make it easy for men to record their votes. That having been done, it was absurd to restrict their choice of candidates. He believed that under our present system, so great were the sacrifices required from a man who was to be a candidate for Parliament, that there was a real danger of the confidence in the representative character of the House of Commons being undermined. That was a serious argument in favour of the Motion. In logic he believed it to be irresistible. Having extended the franchise, the House of Commons was bound to make the choice of candidates free, and they could not resist that logical conclusion, unless they were prepared to say that practical consequences which would flow from the payment of Members were so grievous and injurious as to necessitate putting logic on one side. Would there be consequences of that kind? Would payment alter the character of the House of Commons? [AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.] Very well. Then the further question remained: Would it alter it for the worse? In his belief it would not alter the character of the House for the worse, but, on the whole, for the better. Putting comparisons with foreign countries aside, because representative institutions worked out differently in almost every country, what was the effect likely to be amongst us at home? The effect was likely to be twofold as regarded the composition of that House. It would conduce more to the return of local men to represent the constituencies. There would always be cases where constituencies would honour themselves by passing over their own men and selecting men of real distinction in public life, in letters, or in business to represent them. But there was often the case where a constituency which needed to choose a candidate on one side or the other had in its own ranks, or within its own borders, some local man whom it knew and trusted and desired to have as its representative, and whom it was unable to have because that man could not afford the sacrifice now entailed upon him; and over and over again constituencies were placed in this discouraging position, that they were obliged to pass by the man whom they knew and would like to choose, and go outside for a man, probably a most excellent man, but one of whom they knew little, and who had as little knowledge of them. If they had payment of Members and payment of election expenses it would do a great deal to set free constituencies to induce men living amongst themselves, and whom they knew and trusted, to come forward as representatives; and the first effect would be an increase in the number of constituencies which were represented by men coming from within their own borders. That, he thought, would be to the good; certainly not to the bad. Men of real distinction would have just as little difficulty as now in being chosen.

In the next place, this change would undoubtedly help to increase the number of Labour Members. Of the present Labour Members it had been said that they had solved the difficulty of coming here. But why should they have the difficulty to solve? The number of Labour representatives had increased in recent years, but very slowly, and when they came to look at the enormous number of the wage-earning classes in the electorate and considered how intimately their interests were connected with the social problems with which the House of Commons had to deal, could it be said it was not desirable to have a larger Labour representation? The House of Commons took a genuine and sympathetic interest in these social problems, but the House of Commons would never push its way through the thicket of these problems unless persistently urged thereto by a large body of Labour representatives. Such an increase should be welcomed on the ground of experience. The Labour representatives, as a group, compared with any other group in the House for a high percentage of merit, ability, and capacity, and experience since the franchise was lowered in 1885 would lead him to regard such an increase, not only without apprehension, but with great approval. When the first Parliament met after 1885 a good many people entertained considerable apprehension as to the composition of the new House, and feared the extension of the franchise would bring in a large body of men with crude ideas ready to embark upon revolutionary schemes. His deliberate experience since then had been to convince him that what was needed in the future House of Commons was more propelling power and less brake. That, he thought, would be the change which this proposal would be likely to effect in the composition of the House of Commons, and such a change was necessary for the solution of those social problems which they all admitted were pressing, and which, he believed, they all deplored, were advancing so slowly towards a solution. The tendency of the House of Commons was to err on the side of too much caution.

How would payment of Members affect the discharge of their duty? He believed that with good average human nature payment intensified, and did not weaken, the sense of obligation. Take the Ministers, for instance. He could quite believe that a man who undertook the office of a Minister gratuitously would feel under an obligation to do his best in the discharge of the duties of that office, but the sense of responsibility and obligation was quickened by the salary he received. He was the servant of the public, and no man was the worse servant because he was well treated by his employer. More or less, that was the position of all Members—they were servants of the public, and he did not believe that the receipt of a salary would impair their sense of responsibility. That the intensity of that sense would keep men away from the House, because they would feel they must give their whole attention and time to their Parliamentary duties, he did not believe. If the salaries were such as were paid to Ministers that might be so, but not with a salary of from £200 to £400 a year. The payments made to directors of public companies gave no claim to the whole of a man's attention. He was a director of a public company, but if he took the view that the salary he was paid was such as demanded his undivided attention he should certainly resign either his position as a director of the company or his position in the House of Commons; but if that company claimed the whole of his time, he should cease to call himself a director and claim the position and salary of a general manager. They received as directors of public companies the same sort of salary as that which was now advocated for Members of the House of Commons. What was advocated was not remuneration, but indemnity for expenditure out of pocket. If it was contended that this payment was a sort of remuneration instead of an indemnity: he would meet that objection by saying that, although a few men might seek a seat in that House for the sordid consideration of the remuneration that they were likely to receive, there were many public-spirited men who desired for honourable and legitimate motives to enter Parliament, but were now kept out, who would be able to do so. Supposing undesirable men did come forward, he believed they would be far outnumbered by desirable public-spirited men, and he would trust the constituencies to choose rightly among them.

One objection to this proposal was that it would lead to a multiplicity of candidates. They must meet that by the second ballot. The second ballot was, he thought, already a necessity. This proposal of his hon. friend's was a very moderate one. It would not do anything; even if it were carried out there would remain many inequalities and disadvantages. The advantages of wealth and leisure with regard to entering the House of Commons would always be very great. His hon. friend behind him had said that some constituences were exorbitant in their demands for subscriptions. That was an undesirable element in public life, but that House could not prevent it. All they could say in cases like that was that if a constituency chose their candidate for the length of his purse they deserved to be misrepresented. But even in other and more reputable, indirect ways, some of them beyond reproach, he thought men of wealth and leisure would continue, even under payment of Members, to have considerable advantages with regard to entrance into that House. But he did believe that it was desirable to redress the inequalities and disadvantages that now existed. He believed that by opening the door wider, as this Motion would undoubtedly do, they would, without diminishing the quality and character of the House of Commons, widen the choice of the constituencies with regard to candidates, and would increase the representative character of that House. He believed that the results of this proposal, if it was carried out, would be beneficial, and he should have no hesitation in voting for the Motion.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): This is a question which has not been before the House for some time, but it is a subject which seems to enjoy a certain periodicity of recurrence. The hon. Member who seconded this Motion told the House of the various times during his Parliamentary life when he brought this subject before the House, and he told us how from a bad beginning this question had only been beaten by a gradually diminishing majority. But the hon. Member forgot that when in 1893 a Motion declaring that a reasonable salary should be granted to Members of Parliament forthwith, the right hon. Member for West Monmouth chose to interpret "forthwith" as meaning "when you have time and money," and although his Government remained in office for two years after that Motion was carried they never put that translation of "forthwith" into practice. I am very glad to acknowledge the extreme moderation and ability with which the arguments in favour of this Motion were presented to the House by both the hon. Member who moved and the hon. Member who seconded it. I look at this as above all things a practical question. The hon. Member for Wansbeck who seconded the Motion said that he had never heard it argued against in principle, and that he did not suppose that he would hear any arguments of that character to-night. I think that for the moment he forgot the terms of the Motion which he was supporting, because it is not based upon principle but upon expediency. When the hon. Member came to explain what he meant by "expediency," I think his definition was that all he meant was that the present occasion was not a very opportune one on which to spend money. On this question it is impossible to distinguish between arguments of expediency and those of principle, it is really a practical question—one of the balance of advantage. The only question of principle which the hon. Member put forward was when he said that all service ought to be paid for. I do not think that that is a proposition which will bear examination, and it is one which, if followed to its logical conclusion, would not only lead to the payment of Members of Parliament but to the payment of all the various other classes of people besides Members of Parliament, such as the members of county councils, justices of the peace, and so on; and it might even be extended to giving the voter a day's wages to induce him to record his vote on the polling day. The hon. Member tried to run away from that position by explaining that the logical outcome was not to force us to pay such bodies as the county councils, because their attendance was not such as that which was demanded in the House of Commons. The only other argument of a general character was the supposition that the payment of Members of Parliament follows as a logical consequence from the fact that Ministers receive salaries, and one hon. Member opposite stated that he could not see the difference between a Cabinet Minister and an ordinary Member of the House having a salary. If a Minister of the Crown was paid for being a Member of the House of Commons the position taken up would be perfectly true, but I apprehend that a Minister of the Crown is paid for no such thing, but he receives his salary for services rendered in his office, and not for services in the House at all. Whatever may be the view of hon. Members as to the expediency or otherwise of granting what are known as political pensions, I think it is well to remind them that such pensions are only accepted by a very limited number of Ministers, and they should be regarded more as extra remuneration or deferred pay to the person who has given his services to the State. The outcome of all this is that after all hon. Members who are in favour of this Motion have treated it from a point of view from which I am not prepared to treat it, as a question of expediency.

The particular grievance which it is sought to remedy by this Motion, is, we are told, that under the present system freedom of choice is limited. Perhaps it is not inappropriate to ask if you get work well done for nothing, why should you pay for it? I apprehend that there is no answer to that question unless you can say that you would get better work done if you paid for it. So that we come back to the old proposition of freedom of choice. I controvert the proposition at once that you would get any greater freedom of choice if you paid Members than you do under the present system. Would you get under payment of Members the class of men you want? I think you would not. I desire at once to brush away what I think was an entire misapprehension in the mind of the hon. Member for the Barnard Castle Division who proposed this Motion, and this is the only portion of his very able speech with which I entirely disagree. He said that in the mind of hon. Members of this House the professional politician and Labour Members were convertible terms. The great thing we admire in the present Labour Members is that they are not professional politicians, for we all know on what terms they come to the House. They must have made those who sent them here so sure that they are the right men to send, that they are not only willing to vote for them but willing to make certain pecuniary sacrifices from very small incomes in order to provide those hon. Members with the funds which are necessary to enable them to enter this House. That is a very good test of hon. Members being proper Labour Members. I will ask the Labour Members, do they really suppose that if a salary of £200 or £300 a year were given to Members of Parliament the same class of men would be obtained with the same certainty as you get under the present system. I think I am speaking to a good many hon. Members who know what would be the result if they inserted an advertisement in one of the daily papers tomorrow saying that they wanted a private secretary and were willing to pay £300 a year. How many applications would they get? I am certain the applications they would receive would fill many waste-paper baskets. What class of men would they get? No doubt good, bad, and indifferent, and it would be exceedingly difficult to discriminate between the quality of those who offered their services. Therefore I object to the professional politician, for his introduction would ruin the character of this House, which has made its name so high amongst the representative institutions of the world. Professional politicians would bring with them certain dangers which would be liable to be engrafted upon our political system, and they are dangers which we can avoid so long as the professional politician is not with us.

Let me tell the House what I consider a professional politician to be. I will quote from a work by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Aberdeen, whose fate it has been to write works, both on the Eastern and Western hemispheres, which are continually quoted against the opinions which he promulgates in this House. I, of course, allude to the right hon. Member's standard work on America, in which he wrote—

> "Politics has now become a gainful profession in America, like advocacy, stockbroking, the dry goods trade, or the getting up of companies. People go into it to live by it, primarily for the sake of the salaries attached to the places they count on getting, secondarily in view of the opportunities it affords of making incidental and sometimes illegitimate gains. Every person in a high administrative post, whether federal, State, or municipal, and above all, every member of Congress, has opportunities of rendering services to wealthy individuals and companies for which they are willing to pay secretly in money or money's worth."

That is the description of the state of affairs that arises where there is the professional politician. [OPPOSITION cries of "Protection."] That has a very remote bearing indeed on the question I am now addressing to the House. If it had any relevancy one would like to know what difference it would make on the temptations to corruption. How would that be differentiated by the fact that Members had £300 a year or had not? There, as I say, is a picture of what may happen on the introduction of the professional politician. It is a picture that represents dangers from which at present in this country we are admittedly free, and I am bound to say that a great many of the arguments which have been adduced, not only to-night but at other times, seem to me on this point to be exceedingly beside the mark. I mean beside the mark in this sense, that I cannot see how anyone can suppose that if there was any temptation to corruption the question of having a salary would be a protection against that corruption. I remember a speech on this very subject ten years ago by the hon. Member for Battersea, when he detailed in a rather graphic manner an insult that had been offered to himself in that way. Well, I take it that the letter he got, and in which he was offered £50 for his vote, was only written when he was a new Member, and because people did not know the man they had to deal with, and I do not suppose he has had many letters of that kind since he became a better known man. But if you suppose that that sort of offer had any temptation for him or anyone else, do you suppose that it would be a safeguard from temptation if he had a stipend of £300 a year? The position would be worse, because if £50 would not be enough something else would. You cannot have anything in that matter to trust to except character. It is your only safeguard, and, therefore, I say I cannot see how it is supposed that the giving of a salary would be a protection. Besides this question of the professional politician, there are one or two other matters worthy of notice. One has been alluded to by the hon. Baronet who has just sat down. He, I think, admitted quite frankly that he thought the result would be a considerable increase in the return of local men as against other persons. Well, I agree with him. We have a very homely Scotch proverb, so homely that I do not think I could express the idea as well. It means that you should keep for your own locality the advantages which that locality offers. I cannot help thinking that if there was anything going there would be a strong local feeling that a local man should get it, and if so, I grieve to think what at one time would have been the representation on the Front Bench opposite when hospitable Scotland entertained so many of those who had come from England.

There has been a great deal of speaking to-night on what I think is a real grievance, and a thing against which we all strive. I mean the tax that is put upon Members of Parliament in other ways in the form of subscriptions and so on. The hon. Baronet the Member for North Norfolk gave us a graphic description of how he failed in an election because the opposite candidate was given out to be a man with £80,000 a year, while he himself was represented as not having a halfpenny. I could not help thinking as the hon. Baronet spoke that he failed entirely to see that although that might be very hard the present proposition would not cure it in the least. The £80,000 a year would be just as superior to the poor person who was going to get £300 a year as to the person who was supposed to have nothing at all, because I do not suppose the stipend is going to allow any superfluities for the giving of subscriptions to local clubs. I think the effect of this measure if passed would be rather different from what some people think. I am quite certain that one effect would be a very much greater length to Parliament than at present. Hon. Members are often telling us that we ought to face the country. There would be no threat so terrible as a dissolution if it meant that every man was to loose his salary. The hon. Member who moved the Motion was wisely silent as to where the money should come from. The hon. Member who seconded it introduced that slightly archaic flavour which is sometimes so dear to hon. Members opposite by saying that this proposal was only to reintroduce the ancient practice of the realm. He forgot, I think, to tell us that it was the ancient practice of the realm for Members to be paid locally by the places that sent them, and that some places got so tired of the operation that they preferred to send no Members at all. Fearing that misadventure I suppose the proposal has generally been to put the charge on the Consolidated Fund. But I would like to make what I think is really a new suggestion to hon. Members. Why not put it on the Estimates? Then we should have one really lively evening when moving reductions on each other's salaries. I am not guilty of being a humorist, but even I could impart liveliness to a Scotch debate by examining in turn each of my compatriots and leaving them in delightful suspense as to whose salary I should like to move a reduction of in order to put myself in order at the end of my speech. I do not think any question of principle in the proper sense is involved in this Motion. Seeing the men who have in the past devoted themselves voluntarily to the service of the nation, seeing the reputation for incorruptibility which this House has always enjoyed, and seeing also that even under our present system it is not impossible to secure proper representatives of the labouring classes by the method which I have pointed out, and which makes it certain that those who send them here are sending the right men, I think it would be striking a blow at the idea of free and voluntary service which would cut deep into our national life if the Government accepted this Motion in any form whatsoever.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 155; Noes, 221. (Division List No. 120.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P.
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bell, Richard
Black, Alexander William
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Burke, E. Haviland
Burns, John
Burt, Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Caldwell, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobbie, Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herb. John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. (Berwick
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hammond, John
Harcourt, Lewis V.(Rossendale
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kilbride, Denis
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Jos. F. (Accrington)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M‘Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M‘Crae, George
M‘Hugh, Patrick A.
M‘Kean, John
M‘Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
M‘Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mitchell, Edw. (Fermanagh, N.)
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parrott, William
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Priestley, Arthur
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Rigg, Richard
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roche, John
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Slack, John Bamford
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt.Hn.C.R(Northants
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, D. Alfred (Merthyr)
Thomas, J.A(Glamorgan, Gower
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, Jn. Cathcart (Orkney)
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J.(York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wood, James
Woodhouse, Sir J.T(Huddersf'd
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Henderson and Mr. Fenwick.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt.Hn.Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt.Hn.Sir H.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George

Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Mich. Hicks
Bignold, Arthur
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brymer, William Ernest
Bull, William James
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain,RtHn J.A(Worc.
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim,S.)
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies, Sir H. D. (Chatham)
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dimsdale, Rt. Hn.Sir Joseph C.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt.Hn. Sir WilliamHart
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Faber, Edmund B. (Hants., W.
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster, P. S. (Warwick, S.W.)
Fyler, John Arthur
Galloway, William Johnson
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Gordon, Hn.J.E.(Elgin&Nairn)
Gordon, Maj. E. (T'r Hamlets)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D.(Shrewsbury)
Gretton, John
Groves, James Grimble
Hall, Edward Marshall
Hamilton,Marq of(L'nd'nderry
Hardy, L. (Kent. Ashford)
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th
Harris, Dr. Fredk. R. (Dulwich
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Heath, A. Howard (Hanley)
Heath, James (Staffords., N.W.
Henderson, Sir A.(Stafford, W.
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hobhouse,RtHn H(Somers't,E
Hope, J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Hoult, Joseph
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jessel, Captain Hebert Merton
Kennaway, Rt.Hn.Sir John H.
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W.(Salop.
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Knowles, Sir Lees
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, J. Grant (Yorks., N.R.
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hon. W. (Bristol, S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J.(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Calmont, Colonel James
M'Iver, SirLewis(Edinburgh,W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Majendie, James A. H.
Malcolm, Ian
Manners, Lord Cecil
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell,RtHn.Sir H.E(Wigt'n
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt.Hn.Sir Frederick G.
Milvain, Thomas
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Montagu, Hn. J. Scott (Hants.)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Moore, William
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Nicholson, William Graham
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Peel, Hn.Wm.Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rasch, Sir Frederick Carne
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Richards, Henry Charles
Ridley, Hon. M.W.(Stalybridge
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rose, Charles Day
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sandys, Lt.-Col. Thos. Myles
Saunderson,Rt.Hn.Col. Edw.J.
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Maj.J.E.B.(Isle of Wight
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford, East)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond, Rt.Hn.Sir WilliamH.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.-Col.A.C.E(Taunton
Wely, Sir Chas. G. E. (Notts.)
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whiteley, H.(Ashton und.Lyne
Willoughby, de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wodehouse, Rt.Hn. E.R.(Bath
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Younger, William

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland - Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

POPULATION OF THE HIGHLANDS.

Mr. AINSWORTH (Argyllshire) moved that a Select Committee be appointed to consider and report on the decrease of population in the crofting counties of Scotland and the causes of and remedies for the same. He hoped the Secretary for Scotland would be able to accede to this request. The right hon. Gentleman knew the immense importance of this question, not only to Scotland, but to the country at large.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a Select Committee be appointed to consider and report on the decrease of population in the Crofting Counties of Scotland and the causes of and remedies for the same."—(*Mr. Ainsworth.*)

The SECRETARY of STATE for SCOTLAND (Mr. A. Graham Murray, Buteshire) said he thought the hon. Member was not really serious in bringing forward the Motion at so late an hour. It would be impossible for the Government to pledge themselves on this matter, because they did not know that there was any necessity for such an inquiry as that proposed. He had not heard a single word from the hon. Member in support of the proposal.

And, it being Midnight, the debate stood adjourned.

PORT OF LONDON BILL.

Motion made, and Question put, "That proceedings upon the Port of London Bill may be resumed."—(*Mr. Gerald Balfour.*)

The House divided:—Ayes, 165; Noes, 85. (Division List No. 121.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Allen, Charles P.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Mich. Hicks
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bignold, Arthur
Black, Alexander William
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bond, Edward
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Brymer, William Ernest
Causton, Richard Knight
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A (Worc.
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Cust, Henry John C.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Davies, Sir H. D. (Chatham)
Denny, Colonel
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Dickson, Charles Scott
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Ellis, John Edward (Notts.)
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Forster, Henry William
Foster, P. S. (Warwick, S.W.)
Fyler, John Arthur
Galloway, William Johnson
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Gordon, Maj. E. (T'r Hamlets)
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Gretton, John
Gurdon, Sir William Brampton
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nderry
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th
Harris, Dr. Fredk. R. (Dulwich
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Heath, A. Howard (Hanley)
Heath, James (Staffords., N.W.
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop
Kerr, John
Keswick, William
Knowles, Sir Lees
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, J. Grant (Yorks., N.R
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hon. W. (Bristol, S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lough, Thomas
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Calmont, Colonel James

M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh, W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Percy, Earl
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Pym, C. Guy
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Reid, James (Greenock)
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rose, Charles Day
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Sandys, Lt.-Col. Thos. Myles
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. Edw. J
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Stock, James Henry
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Toulmin, George
Tuff, Charles
Ure, Alexander
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hal
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wylie, Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong

Tellers for the Ayes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Barry E. (Cork, S.)
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Burke, E. Haviland
Caldwell, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Channing, Francis Allston
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dimsdale, Rt. Hn. Sir Joseph C.
Dobbie, Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H.
Hayden, John Patrick
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Horniman, Frederick John
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kilbride, Denis
Law, Hugh Alex. (Donegal, W.
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cornwall)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Jos. F. (Accrington
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Logan, John William
Lundon, W.
M'Crae, George
McHugh, Patrick A.
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Mitchell, Edw. (Fermanagh, N.)
Montagu, Hn. J. Scott (Hants.)
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Malley, William
Parrott, William
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Priestley, Arthur
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Roche, John
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Slack, John Bamford
Sullivan, Donal
Wason, Jn. Cathcart (Orkney)
White, George (Norfolk)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Wilson, Henry J. (York. W.R.)
Wood, James

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Warner and Mr. Corrie Grant.

Bill to be considered in Committee upon Monday next, and, as amended in the Select Committee of last session, to be printed. [Bill 193.]

On the Motion, "That the House do now adjourn."

Mr. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe) asked whether it was intended to take the Port of London Bill on Monday.

The PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Sir A. Acland-Hood, Somersetshire, Wellington) said it was put down formally for Monday, but the Second Reading of the Finance Bill would be taken on that day.

Adjourned at a quarter after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 12th May, 1904.

The House met at Two of the Clock.

MR. SPEAKER'S INDISPOSITION.

The House being met, the Clerk at the Table informed the House of the unavoidable absence of Mr. SPEAKER, owing to the continuance of his indisposition.

Whereupon Mr. JAMES WILLIAM LOWTHER, the Chairman of Ways and Means, proceeded to the Table, and after Prayers, took the Chair as Deputy Speaker, pursuant to the Standing Order.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz. :—St. Bartholomew's Hospital Bill [Lords]; Clyde Valley Electrical Power Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz. :—Local Government Provisional Orders (Gas) Bill.

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time To-morrow.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS (NO STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE).

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, referred on the First Reading hereof, no Standing Orders are applicable, viz. :—Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill; Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill.

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time To-morrow.

Kettering Improvement Bill. Lord Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Plymouth Corporation Bill. Read the third time, and passed.

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway (Various Powers) Bill. As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 4). Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board for Ireland relating to the Rural Districts of Rathdown (No. 1) and Rathdown (No. 2), ordered to be brought in by Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland and Mr. Wyndham.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill. "To confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board for Ireland relating to the Rural Districts of Rathdown (No. 1) and Rathdown (No. 2)," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 194.]

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill. Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time to-morrow.

Liverpool and London and Globe Insurance Company Bill [Lords]. Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table.

Chesterfield Corporation (Tramways and Improvements) Bill [Lords]; University of Leeds Bill [Lords]. Yorktown and Blackwater Gas Bill [Lords]. Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

RAILWAY BILLS (GROUP No. 5).

Mr. Compton Rickett reported from the Committee on Group No. 5 of Railway Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, they had adjourned till Tuesday next, at Eleven of the clock.

Report to lie upon the Table.

RAILWAY BILLS (GROUP No. 8).

Mr. Henry Hobhouse reported from the Committee on Group No. 8 of Railway Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, they had adjourned till Monday next, at Twelve of the clock.

Report to lie upon the Table.

RAILWAY BILLS (GROUP No. 8).

Mr. Henry Hobhouse reported from the Committee on Group No. 8 of Railway Bills; That Mr. Crean, one of the Members of the said Committee, was not present during the Sitting of the Committee this day.

Report to lie upon the Table.

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions for alteration; from Dunoon; and Leith; to lie upon the Table.

LICENCES (RENEWAL).

Petitions against alteration of Law; from High Wycombe; Exeter (two); Wakefield; Essex; Ilford; Hampstead; Pendleton; Brentford; Hull (three); South Lambeth Road; Avon Valley; Hyde; Wimbledon; Lewisham (two); Lee; Hither Green; Portsmouth; Southsea; Preston; Sheffield; Stretford; Walworth Road; Hurstmonceux; Oldbury; Walbottle; Sugley; Newcastle on Tyne (four); Causeway Lane; Middlesbrough; North Devon; Bedford Row; Cheriton; Denbigh; North Wales; Swanscombe; Durham; Ealing; Acocks Green; Victoria (Mon.); South Birmingham; Tregarthen; Heanor; Penzance (four), Allendale; Worthing; Homerton; Watlington; Greenheys; Rusholme; Slough; Tamworth; Morton; Bourne (three); Leigh; Thurlby; Wolverhampton; Iver; Upton Manor; Cleveland; Skinningrove; Cale Green; Plymouth; Gorton; Manchester; Widcombe; Great Saughall; Cricklade; Liverpool; Oldham; and Boston; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions against; from West Norfolk; Hanley; Upper Holloway; Bootle (ten); Macclesfield (two); Liverpool (seven); Eston; Newhaven (two); Devonshire; Radnor Park; Modbury; Gateshead (five); Southport (five); Helmsdale; Burradon; Leicester (thirteen); South Bank (two); Chiswick; South Acton; Bournemouth (seven); Westbourne; Christchurch; St. Ives; Halstead; Glasgow (three); Teignmouth; Dudley; Wallsend; Walker; Walbottle; Camperdown; Bradford (two); Dunvant; Clydach (three); Pontardawe; Libanus Gorseinon; Killybebyll; Gillingham (two); Lewes; Devonport; Hylton; Weston on Trent; Wakefield (three); Wheatley Hill; Saltcoats; Lytehill; New Lambton; Headington; North Metropolitan Union; Fraserburgh; Upper Parkstone; East Ham (four); Hornchurch; Ilford (two); Newton Abbot; Haslington; Fence Houses; Greenock (two); Hove; Stockport; South Hackney; Pendleton; Great Horton; Chudleigh; Ballachulish; Hull (two); Borough Green; Lurgan; Market Harborough (four); Oxford; Cambridge; Wandsworth Road; Ringwood; Brockenhurst; Totton; Fordingbridge; Ossett (five); Oadby (two); Lutterworth; Southampton (two); Morley (three); Falmouth; South Ossett; Studley; Teddington; Larkhall; Westminster; Strathaven; Coupar Angus; Lewisham (three); Forest Hill; Deer; Blairgowrie; Wallington; Boness; Dunoon; Bath (two); Stranraer; East Nottingham; East Belfast; Haverfordwest; Calne; Chippenham (five); Lacock (two); Kington Langley; Kington St. Michael; Stretford; Kelveden; Foxton; Lambeth; Godalming; Gosforth; Pontardawe; Llansamlet; Attleborough; Bolton (three); Royston; Truro; Ballymena; Edinburgh (five); Hornsey; Luton; Derby; Abergele; Ipswich; Wavertree West; East Wickham;

Bexley Heath; Lichfield; Erith; Orpington; Middlesex; Barnstaple; Grangetown (two); Swansea (three); Blackpool; Dartford; Balsall Heath; East Bradford; Willington; Woo house Carr; Bardon Park; St. George in the East; Horton; Plymouth (two); Saint Andrew; Newcastle upon Tyne (eight); Tiverton; Grantham; Aberdeen; Mid Shropshire; Slough; Hurstmonceux; Burradown and Camperdown; Lynton; Appledon; Combe Martin (two); Bideford; Ombersley; Torquay (three); Rhymney; Tredegar; Cwmsyfiog; Durham; Oldham; Royton; Hollinwood; Chelsea (two); Kensington; Stroud Green; Hull; North of England Temperance League; Buxton; Bradwell; Glossop; Harringay; Westcliffe on Sea; Staines; Rugby; Woodford; Windsor; Thame; Henley on Thames; Manchester; York; Kidlington; Mynydd Bach; Heaton; Bourne; Birmingham (four); Worcester; Bristol; Castleton (five); Turriff; Redcar; Kilmarnock; Dumbarton; Port Glasgow; Stranraer (two); Throop and Moordawn (two); Branksome; Wiltshire; Weymouth; Machynlleth; Bont; Bootle cum Linacre; West Fife; Lochgelly; Hollinwood; Sheffield; Buckhaven (two); Micheldever; Nottingham; Whitehaven; Whitchurch; Penrith; Wigton; Higher Openshaw; Sunny Side; Alnwick; Teddington; Bedfont; Poplar; Leeds; and West Gorton; to lie upon the Table.

MERCHANT SHIPPING (LIGHTHOUSES) BILL.

Petition from Newcastle and Gateshead, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

MUSICAL COPYRIGHT BILL,

Petition from Glasgow, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION.

Petition from Bath, for legislation; to lie upon the Table.

PUBLIC LIBRARIES BILL.

Petition from Bermondsey, against; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF BUTTER BILL.

Two Petitions from Brighton, against; to lie upon the Table.

TUBERCULOSIS (ANIMALS) COMPENSATION BILL.

Petition from Newcastle on Tyne, against; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND).

Copy presented, of a Selection of Circular Letters of the Scotch Education Department, 1898–1904, with Explanatory Memorandum [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

EAST INDIA (ESTIMATE).

Copy presented, of Estimate of Revenue and Expenditure of the Government of India for 1903–4, compared with the results of 1902–3 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 170.]

EAST INDIA (FINANCE AND REVENUE ACCOUNTS).

Copy presented, of Finance and Revenue Accounts of the Government of India for 1902–3 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

EAST INDIA (HOME ACCOUNTS).

Copy presented, of Home Accounts of the Government of India [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 171.]

EDUCATION (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Annual Report of the Commissioners of Education in Ireland for the year 1903 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

ULTIMUS HÆRES (SCOTLAND) (ACCOUNT AND LIST OF ESTATES).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 9th May; *Mr. Victor Cavendish*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 172.]

GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS SECURITIES.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 28th March; *Mr. Victor Cavendish*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 173.]

INEBRIATES ACTS, 1879 TO 1899 (REGULATIONS FOR STATE INEBRIATE REFORMATORIES).

Copy presented, of Regulations made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, in pursuance of The Inebriates Act, 1898, for the management and discipline of State Inebriate Reformatories [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 174.]

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, amending the Aldershot and Farnborough Light Railway Order, 1902 (Aldershot and Farnborough Light Railway (Amendment) Order, 1904) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, amending the Cranbrook and Tenterden Light Railway Order, 1899, and for other purposes (Kent and East Sussex Light Railway (General Powers) Order, 1904) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

RAILWAY AND CANAL TRAFFIC ACT, 1888.

Copy presented, of Report by the Board of Trade in accordance with Section 24, Sub-section (4) of the Act, on the Schedule of Maximum Rates and Charges to be made applicable to the Canals of the Regents Canal and Dock Company [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 175.]

LIGHTHOUSES, ETC. (LOCAL INSPECTIONS).

Copies presented, of Reports to the Board of Trade by the Trinity House of Deptford Strond, the Commissioners of Northern Lighthouses, and the Commissioners of Irish Lights of their Inspection of Local Lighthouses, Buoys, and Beacons [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 176.]

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3159 and 3160 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Inspection of Holdings on Powerscourt Estate.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that in fair rent cases heard on the Powerscourt Estate, county Wicklow, in December last, the Assistant Commissioner has not yet inspected the holdings; and if he can state when the decisions will be given in such cases.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The hearing of the remainder of the cases on the list referred to, and which included one case on the Powerscourt Estate, was not taken up until the 1st February last, owing to an accident which happened to the Lay Assistant Commissioner, who on then resuming work after his illness had a considerable number of cases on hand awaiting inspection. From inquiries which have been made, it appears that notice of inspection has already been issued in the case on Lord Powerscourt's estate, and it is expected that judgment will be given in the case by an early date.

Return of Licensed Premises.

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE (Somersetshire, E.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he will grant a Return, by county and county boroughs, of the number (with totals) of hotels, alehouses, and beerhouses, classified according to annual values corresponding to those in the scale of maximum charges scheduled to the Licensing Bill.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) I am in consultation with the Board of Inland Revenue, who are preparing figures of the nature desired by my right hon. friend. I am anxious to give the fullest information possible, and hope that a Return may be ready for presentation to the House within no long time.

Factories and Workshops—Fire Precautions.

MR. TENNANT (Berwickshire): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home

Department whether he has yet considered the question of the means of escape from fire in factories and workshops and the Bill before the House; and whether he will take steps for the appointment of a Select Committee on this subject.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) I have considered the Bill which the hon. Member has introduced to amend the law relating to the provision of means of escape from fire in factories and workshops, but while I recognise that it is an attempt to deal with a matter of importance, which stands in need of some remedy, I do not think that the Bill is one which the House could be recommended to accept without very full investigation and discussion. In particular, the danger from fire is not peculiarly a factory question, and I do not think that the matter could be satisfactorily dealt with unless there was also brought into consideration the case of other lofty buildings where considerable numbers of persons are gathered together. The whole question, is perhaps, one for investigation by a Select Committee of the House, and if the hon. Member were to move for the appointment of such a Committee and could agree with me as to the terms of reference, I should not oppose the proposal.

Postmastership of Ferns (Ireland).

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Wexford, N.): To ask the Postmaster-General if his attention has been called to the appointment of a town postman at Liverpool to the Postmastership at Ferns, county Wexford, Ireland; and, if so, will he state was this vacancy announced in the usual way in the Post Office Circular; if not, what was the reason for withholding the announcement; how many applications for this position were received from members of the Irish postal service, and what was the length of service of each applicant; what is the length of service of the man appointed to the position; and what are his qualifications for the same.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) The vacancy was advertised in the usual way in the Post Office Circular. There were seventy-three candidates, of whom twenty-five were in the Irish postal service. The officer whom I appointed was the senior of the recommended candidates, and I selected him as the most suitable. His service dates from July 1886. I may perhaps add that a sorting clerk and telegraphist from Ireland was quite recently appointed to a postmastership in England.

English and Irish Postmasterships

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he will supply a Return showing the number of Irish postmasterships given to English postal officials, and of English postmasterships given to Irish postal officials during the past ten years.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) The Return suggested by the hon. Member would be misleading, since it would suggest a separation which fortunately does not exist between the Post Office Service in England and Ireland. By "English postal official" I presume that the hon. Member means a postal official occupying a post in England. If that is his meaning, many "English postal officials" are Irishmen.

Southport Post Office.

MR. GODDARD (Ipswich): To ask the Postmaster-General, having regard to the fact that there exists a rule in the postal service stating that the relatives of superior officials are not to be appointed in the same offices, whether it is intended to apply the rule to the Southport office, in view of the fact that the son of the postmaster is stationed there at present.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) Yes, it is intended to apply the rule in question to the Southport Post Office. The officer referred to was allowed to serve temporarily in the Southport office during a period of convalescence, but instructions had already been issued for him to return at an early date to the office to which he is permanently attached.

Appointments for Learners in Central Telegraph Office, London.

MR. CREMER (Shoreditch, Haggerston): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that learners in the

Central Telegraph Office, London, after having passed the necessary tests, have had their appointments withheld on the grounds that youths who were higher in the list at the literary examination had not received appointments; if so, will he say whether it is the intention of the Department that learners who show special aptitude in telegraphy should not receive the benefit of their industry; and whether he will inquire into the circumstances of the cases.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) The general practice throughout the service is that, when a vacancy occurs in the established class, a selection is made amongst the learners who have qualified in telegraphy, and the one who stood highest in the literary examination is appointed. I am aware that in some cases the preference has been given to the learner who passed the test in telegraphy first; but I consider that the general practice, as I have described it, should be maintained.

Education Act—Appointed Day in Monmouthshire.

MR. McKENNA (Monmouthshire, N.): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether the appointed day for the Education Act to come into operation in Monmouthshire is now the 1st of June.

(*Answered by Sir William Anson.*) The appointed day for the area of the county of Monmouthshire will be 1st June, unless the county council should express a desire for a postponement, in which case the Board would be ready to consult the wishes of the council.

Electric Railway Signals for use in Fogs.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to a new railway signal recently invented in the form of an electric bell; and if there is any intention of it being substituted for the old style of fog signals now used.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) Inventions of this character have been brought to the notice of the Board's inspecting officers from time to time, and, if detailed information as to this particular invention is furnished, they will be glad to have the opportunity of seeing it. The Board have called the attention of the railway companies to the question of the adoption of some mechanical system of fog-signalling, and I am informed that certain companies are making experimental trials of various forms of apparatus. It should be observed that, unless a thoroughly reliable apparatus is produced, grave danger might arise from its use.

Local Government Act, 1888—Counties with Whole-Time Medical Officer of Health.

MR. FREDERICK WILSON (Norfolk, Mid): To ask the President of the Local Government Board if he will grant a Return specifying the counties which up to the present have appointed a whole-time medical officer of health under the provisions of The Local Government Act. 1888.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) A Return was obtained in 1896, "showing the salaries and other remuneration and the terms of appointment of medical officers of health appointed by county councils in England and Wales." If the hon. Member moves for a Return in continuation of this, I shall be happy to assent to its being granted.

Proposed Erection of Sheds on Island facing Kew Gardens.

MR. SKEWES-COX (Surrey, Kingston): To ask the hon. Member for North Huntingdonshire, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether he is aware of a proposal to embank and enlarge an osier bed, known as Lot's Eyot, in the Thames immediately opposite the principal riverside entrance to Kew Gardens, Queen Elizabeth's Lawn, and Palace, and to construct on the eyot a dock and iron sheds for building and repairing barges; whether the Board of Agriculture, in the interests of the amenities of Kew Gardens and the enjoyment of the public, has communicated its views to the Thames Conservancy; and, if so, with what result.

(*Answered by Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.*) An application by the Thames Lighterage Company for permission to enlarge Lot's Eyot and to construct a barge dock on its south-east side has been made to the Thames Conservancy, but I believe that no decision has as yet been arrived at with respect to it. We have for some time past been in communication with the Conservancy and other public bodies on the subject, and have represented to them that the erection of works as proposed would seriously affect the repose and quiet of Kew Gardens, a unique national establishment which has a strong hold on the affections of the public.

Pekin Syndicate—Railway Negotiations with Chinese Government.

MR. YERBURGH (Chester): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in what position the negotiations with the Chinese Government concerning the railways of the Pekin Syndicate now stand.

(*Answered by Earl Percy.*) The only railway with regard to which the Pekin Syndicate is negotiating is the Taokow Tsechow Railway. The negotiations at Shanghai between the agent of the Syndicate and the Director-General of Railways are still proceeding.

Bank of Ireland and Government Balances.

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Cork County, N.E.): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he is aware that the Bank Act of 1892 deals only with the remuneration to be paid the Banks of England and Ireland for their management of the Debt, and in relation to Exchequer Bonds and Treasury Bills; and if he will state what arrangements, outside the Act, have been made between the Treasury and the Bank of Ireland in respect of the benefit derived by that bank from the use of Government balances which, in the ordinary course, it lends out to its customers at interest.

CAPTAIN DONELAN (Cork, E.): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, in connection with the terms of the arrangement made by the Government with the Bank of Ireland under which special consideration was given to the benefit derived by the bank from the use of the Government balances, it was agreed that the same arrangement was to extend to all banking business and to all future balances arising out of the operation of any and every Act of Parliament that might be passed after the date of such arrangement; and, if so, will he state what are the specific terms of the arrangement now subsisting.

(*Answered by Mr Austen Chamberlain.*) The remuneration payable under The Bank Act, 1892, to the Bank of Ireland for management of the Public Debt was fixed after an inquiry which extended to all the transactions of the bank on behalf of the Government. The remuneration was fixed at such rates as, together with the benefit accruing from the use of the Government balances, was thought to be sufficient to afford the bank fair payment for its work both in managing the Debt and in keeping the public accounts. The arrangement of 1892 contemplated that the Government accounts in Dublin should continue to be kept with the Bank of Ireland as they had been for many years before. No specific agreement on that point was required.

War Office Stores—Duty on Ether.

MR. ERNEST GRAY (West Ham, N.): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that ether from pure spirit should be used in the manufacture of certain articles required by the War Office; that this spirit is subject to a heavy duty, and hence, if the article is to be manufactured at a reasonable price, methylated ether must be substituted for the pure, or the contract sent abroad where manufacturers obtain spirit duty free for manufacturing purposes; and whether, under these circumstances, he would consider the desirability of permitting the manufacture of such goods in bond under practicable conditions, or of allowing in the price paid by the War Office for the duty received by the Excise.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) Section 8 of the Finance Act of 1902 appears to cover such cases as the hon. Member has in view. Manufacturers desiring to be allowed the benefit of that section should address an application to the Board of Inland Revenue, by whom it will be carefully considered.

Sum expended under Class 5 of Civil Service Estimates on Transvaal and Orange River Colonies.

MR. REA (Gloucester): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he will state what was the total sum expended under Class 5 of the Civil Service Estimates on the Transvaal and Orange River Colonies in the years 1901–2 and 1902–3 respectively, including any grants-in-aid.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*) Civil Service Estimates. 1901–1902. Class 5. Vote 3.—Transvaal non-effective charges, £946 2s.; Transvaal Special Commission, £2,899 3s. 4d.; Transvaal Concessions and Land Settlement Commissions, £494 9s. 7d.* Vote 6.—Grant-in-Aid of the Revenues of the Transvaal and Orange River Colony, £6,500,000†. 1902–1903. Class 5. Vote 3.—Grant-in-Aid of the Revenues of the Transvaal and Orange River Colony, £1,800,000; Supplementary, £1,000,000; Transvaal non-effective charges, £897 7s. 8d. Vote 8.—Grant-in-Aid of the Revenue of the Transvaal and Orange River Colony, £8,000,000‡; total, £17,305,237 2s. 7d.

Return of Receipts and Expenditure of the Irish Society.

Mr. O'DOHERTY (Donegal, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will grant the Return with reference to the honourable the Irish Society on the Notice Paper of this day.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The preparation of the suggested Return would entail an expenditure of time and labour which would not be commensurate with results, and I regret I am unable, therefore, to agree to it.

The Return referred to is as follows: Irish Society of London.—Return of the Receipts and Expenditure of the honourable the Irish Society of London for the years ending February, 1882, down to February, 1904, both inclusive (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 144, of Session 1878).

Dredging of Irish Harbours.

Sir THOMAS ESMONDE: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if the Board of Works dredger will be sent to Courtown as soon as it has finished its work at Howth and Dunmore, and in view of the number of harbours on the south-east coast of Ireland that require dredging, the Government will provide the Board of Works with another dredger or two for the assistance of the fishermen on the south-east coast of Ireland during the lifetime of the present generation.

(*Answered by Mr. Victor Cavendish.*) The dredger will be required at the Royal Harbours of Dunmore and Howth until the end of the working season. The Board of Works are not charged with the duty of dredging harbours not in their care, and cannot be provided with dredgers for that purpose.

Applications for Restoration to Holdings by Evicted Tenants in Carlow.

Mr. HAMMOND (Carlow): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the names of those evicted tenants of Carlow County who have, up to the present time, made application to the Estate Commissioners for restoration to their former holdings, as also the title of the estates with which they had been severally connected.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) I have communicated this information to the hon. Member.

Kilkee Sanitary Affairs.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Town Commissioners of Kilkee have taken advantage of The Local Government Act, 1890, to be constituted an urban council; and, if not, whether he can say what body has legal authority over the the sanitary affairs of Kilkee and powers to appoint town inspectors and other officers.

---

* Of this sum £287 14s. 8d. has been repaid (Concessions Commission).

† The items are: Civil Administration Transvaal Deficit, £1,500,000 (1); South African Constabulary Maintenance and Equipment, £2,500,000; Railways—(a) Estimated excess of cost of working and maintenance over receipts, £1,000,000 (4); (b) Rolling Stock, £1,000,000 (2); Relief and resettlement, £500,000 (3); £3,000,000 repaid out of Transvaal Guaranteed Loan, viz., (1), (2), (3); £1,000,000, viz. (4), was paid over to the War Office as the railways were under military management.

‡ The items are:—(a) Free grants to burghers under terms of surrender, £3,000,000; (b) Grants to other persons in respect to war losses, £2,000,000; (c) Loans to supplement grants under (a) and (b), £3,000,000; £3,000,000, viz. (c) has been repaid out of the Transvaal Guaranteed Loan.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The reply to the first part of the Question is in the negative. The sanitary authority is the Kilrush Rural District Council under whose control are the sanitary and sanitary sub-officers. The Town Commissioners, as such, are empowered to appoint a town surveyor, inspector of nuisances, clerk, collector, etc.

Teaching Diplomas for Students of St. Patrick's Training College.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that teaching diplomas have not yet been granted to all those teachers presently in the service who were one year students in St. Patrick's Training College during the session 1899–1900, though the reports of the inspectors upon the efficiency of their schools have been on the whole satisfactory for the past two years; and, if so, will he direct that all such omissions on the part of the Education Department will receive immediate attention, and that deserving teachers be sent their diplomas without delay.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The number of such teachers who have not yet been granted training diplomas is sixteen. In the majority of these cases the reports of the inspectors in respect to the efficiency of the teachers are not, I am informed, satisfactory. The other cases are under consideration, and diplomas will be issued as soon as possible.

Ireland—Liability of Landlords of Small Holdings for Rates.

MR. SLOAN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the fact that a number of urban councils throughout Ireland have forwarded resolutions to the Local Government Board, asking the Board to take steps to have the Local Government (Ireland) Act so amended as to make landlords of small holdings liable for rates, as formerly, owing to the loss and difficulty experienced at present in collecting them; and, if so, does he intend to take steps to remedy this evil during the present session.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) I have already stated that the Act of 1898 was based on the principle that the occupier should be rated, and that the Agricultural Grant was fixed upon this understanding. The fundamental change suggested is neither practicable nor desirable.

Disposal of Site of Duke of York's School.

MR. WHITMORE (Chelsea): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can now state whether any decision has been arrived at as to the disposal of the site of the Duke of York's Military School at Chelsea.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) No decision has been arrived at as to the disposal of the site of the Duke of York's School at Chelsea.

Cost of Somaliland Operations.

MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton): To ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state the total cost of the military operations in Somaliland, including the £500,000 Estimate for this year.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) The total estimated cost of the military operations in Somaliland, from 1st October, 1902 (the date from which the charges have been borne by Army Votes) to 31st March, 1904, amounts to £2,100,000. The Estimate of £500,000 for the current financial year includes a sum of £230,000 for the cost of the garrison to be retained in Somaliland after the withdrawal of the expeditionary force. The balance of £270,000, plus the £2,100,000 already referred to, brings the total cost of the campaign to £2,370,000.

Natives Employed by Members of Witwatersrand Native Labour Association.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies what was the number of natives employed in the Transvaal gold mines under the auspices of the Witwatersrand Native Labour Association, on the last day of each month, for each month of 1903 and of 1904 (as far as available).

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttleton.*) The figures given for 1903 in the statement by the Witwatersrand Native Labour Association showing the numbers of natives employed by members of the association (published by the Chamber of Mines in their Annual Report for 1903) are:—1903—January, 50,225; February, 52,759; March, 57,806; April, 60,872; May, 63,832; June, 66,479; July, 68,821; August, 70,892; September, 71,472; October, 72,358; November, 72,978; December, 73,218. I have no other figures for 1904 than those given in my reply to the hon. Member of 9th May.†

Transvaal Labour Ordinance — Repatriation of Wife and Family of a Labourer.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether Section 33 (2) of the Transvaal Ordinance, which casts on the employer the liability for the cost of repatriating the wife and family of the indentured labourer at the end of his indenture, has now been so amended by Regulation No. 34 (Cd. 1986, p. 6), that the employer will only be liable for the expense of returning the wife and children of the labourer in case the labourer dies, or if any of the events detailed in Clauses 25, 26, and 27 of the Ordinance happen during the period of his service which render him liable to be repatriated.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*) There is nothing in Regulation 34 which can override the requirements of the section of the Ordinance referred to.

Transactions of Crown Agents for 1903.

MR. GEORGE WHITE (Norfolk, N.W.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he will cause a Return to be made and presented to this House of all the several transactions of the Crown Agents for the Colonies for the year 1903, giving the nature and date of each transaction, the amount of money involved, the commission charged upon the several transactions, the salaries and fees of each person employed in this work, specifying any who receive any payment voted by this House, and such other information as will enable this House to judge of the system, nature, and cost of the business done by the Crown Agents.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*) A Return is being prepared in reply to the Address of the House ordered on the 2nd instant on the Motion of the hon. Member for Liverpool (East Toxteth), and a separate Paper is being prepared as to the Crown Agents' Office Funds, which has been promised in reply to a Question of the hon. Member for the Chesterfield Division of Derbyshire. These Returns will furnish a great deal of information of the kind referred to at the end of this Question, and it would be quite impracticable to give a Return of all the Crown Agents' separate transactions for any year. There is no person employed in the Crown Agents' Office who receives any payment charged on any Vote of Parliament, as the whole remuneration of the Agents and their staff is paid out of a fund derived from the authorised commissions and fees paid by the Colonial Governments for whom they act.

Disturbances in British New Guinea.

THE MASTER OF ELIBANK (Edinburgh, Midlothian): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he has received any information from the Governor-General of Australia regarding the disturbances in British New Guinea; and, if so, whether he can make any statement in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*) I received a telegram from the Governor-General of Australia on the 10th May stating that he was forwarding a despatch by mail giving particulars regarding the recent disturbances in British New Guinea.

Transvaal Labour Ordinance — Position of Negotiations with Chinese Government.

SIR JOHN LENG (Dundee): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the convention with the Chinese Government relative to the importation of indentured labourers into the Transvaal has been signed; if not, will he state what are the objections of that Government to the terms of the convention, and the present position of the negotiations.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*) The convention has not yet been signed. We are informed that the Chinese Government entertain no objection to its terms, and they have been urgently requested to expedite the formal conclusion of the convention.

---

† See page 751.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Naval Warlike Stores.

MR. J. H. LEWIS (Flint Boroughs): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty what was the value of stocks of naval warlike stores remaining in hand on the 31st March, 1880, 1890, 1900, and 1903 respectively.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. PRETYMAN, Suffolk, Woodbridge): The stock of naval warlike stores was first valued and inserted in Navy Appropriation Account for 1894–95. The figure for 1890 cannot, therefore, be given. The value of stock of naval warlike stores on 31st March, 1895, was £7,890,452; 31st March, 1900, £11,104,347; 31st March, 1903, £14,655,734.

The Chinese Labour Ordinance.

SIR JOHN LENG (Dundee): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the convention with the Chinese Government relative to the importation of Chinese labourers into the Transvaal has been signed.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. LYTTELTON, Warwick and Leamington): I have just received information that the Chinese Minister in this country has received authority to sign the convention, and arrangements for the signature to-morrow afternoon have been made.

Chinese Labour for the Transvaal—Cost of Housing Intending Emigrants at Hong-Kong.

SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether any estimate has been made of the cost of housing intending Chinese emigrants for the Transvaal at Hong-Kong during their detention, for the building and maintenance of the isolation depôt near Kowloon, and for their medical inspection; and by whom the charges for this system of isolation and inspection will be defrayed.

MR. LYTTELTON: I am not aware what the cost of providing for the labourers during their sojourn at Hong-Kong will be. It will be borne by the importer.

Mercantile Association of Swaziland—Transvaal Duties.

MR. JAMES BAILEY (Newington, Walworth): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is aware that the Mercantile Association of Swaziland, Limited, between 4th February and 15th September, 1903, were compelled by the Transvaal Government to pay £1,008 13s. 11d., and other sums since, for Customs duties on goods imported into Swaziland, and that after repeated applications for refund of those duties, the Government at Pretoria on 12th February, 1904, wrote that the Colonial Secretary was not then in a position to fix any date by which the Government would be able to deal with the Swaziland concession, but that it was understood that the Customs duties were paid under protest, subject to refund if it should appear that the Government were not entitled to recover dues; and, if so, can he say when a definite reply will be given.

MR. LYTTELTON: I have not been specifically informed as to the sums which this Association has been called upon to pay for Customs duties but I am aware that the Government has not yet been able to give a definite reply as to the manner in which it proposes to deal with the concessions. I expect that it will be possible to give a reply at an early date, and I propose to receive a deputation of those who represent interests in Swaziland next week.

Tibet Mission—Advance to Lhasa.

MR. FLYNN (Cork County, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether, in view of the fact that a telegraphic despatch was sent from the India Office to the Viceroy on 20th September, 1903, stating that a proposal to advance far into the interior of Tibet was regarded with grave misgiving by the Government, he will state what explanation can be given for the advance so far on the route to Lhasa, and for the continuance of military operations involving loss of the lives of British soldiers and Tibetan natives.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): The Viceroy was informed by telegram of 1st October that His Majesty's Government were prepared to authorise the advance of the Mission to Gyangtse if a complete rupture of the negotiations at Khambajong proved inevitable. On the 6th November, the negotiations having broken down and an overt act of hostility having been committed by the Tibetans, the advance of the Mission was sanctioned, subject to the restrictions imposed by the telegram of that date. The explanation of this advance is fully given in the Blue-book, but His Majesty's Government adhere to the limitations imposed by their telegram of 6th November last.

MR. FLYNN: Is it the fact that on Monday or Tuesday the Amban said he had no orders from Chinese officials to assist the English troops in any way. Is it to be understood that this expedition is being proceeded with without the assent of the suzerain Power, China?

MR. BRODRICK: No, Sir; as I have explained, the sanction of the suzerain Power was first obtained to conduct the negotiations in Tibet, and the suzerain Power is co-operating with us in endeavouring to bring these negotiations to a completion, but the advance of the Amban to Gyangtse has been obstructed by the Tibetan people.

MR. FLYNN: Has the Chinese Government sanctioned this aggressive expedition so far into the interior of the country?

MR. BRODRICK: The Chinese Government have sanctioned the conduct of negotiations in Tibet, and the exact place where the negotiations will be carried out must be a question for His Majesty's Government.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): Do the Government still intend to prohibit the advance of the Mission as far as Lhasa?

MR. BRODRICK: There is a Question on the Paper as to that. I will answer the two together.

MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India if he can state what is the present position of the expedition in Tibet; whether negotiations have further progressed since the expedition started; and whether it is proposed it shall advance or remain at Gyangtse; also, what precautions have been taken to guard the lines of communication.

MR. BRODRICK: His Majesty's Government have arrived at the conclusion that recent events in Tibet make it inevitable that, unless the Tibetans consent to negotiate at Gyangtse, the Mission must advance to Lhasa. The Government of India have been authorised to give the Chinese Amban notice that if no competent Tibetan negotiator appears in conjunction with him at Gyangtse within a period to be fixed by the Government of India, we shall take steps to negotiate at Lhasa itself. The Government of India have at the same time been informed that His Majesty's Government do not intend in any way to depart from the policy laid down in the telegram to the Viceroy of the 6th November last. As to the lines of communication, the necessary measures are being taken by the Government of India.

MR. LAMBERT: What precautions are being taken, if the Tibetans cut across the lines of communication, to secure the safety of the expedition itself?

MR. BRODRICK: I hardly think the hon. Member will expect me to answer that Question, but the attention of the Government of India has been most carefully directed to preserving the lines of communication.

MR. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland): Who is going to be the judge of what a competent envoy from the Lhasa authorities will be?

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): May I ask how at Lhasa or any other place they will make a Power negotiate if they do not wish to do so?

MR. BRODRICK: As regards the question of a competent negotiator, a negotiator will be competent who is of sufficient rank and is empowered by the Tibetan authorities. No one has yet been deputed by the Tibetan authorities to accompany the Amban.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL (Yorkshire, Cleveland): What increase in the number of troops will be necessary?

[No answer was returned.]

Franco-Siamese Treaty.

*__SIR CHARLES DILKE__ (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether by Clauses 10, 11, and 12 of the Franco-Siamese Treaty of the 13th February, alluded to in Lord Lansdowne's despatch covering the Anglo-French Agreement, France secures exceptionally favourable terms as regards the *status* of French protected subjects, who are in an increased degree placed under French jurisdiction; whether he can give the House any information as to the probability of the ratification of the Treaty of the 13th February, or a fresh modification of that treaty, in order that the House may be in a position to consider the agreements entered into with Siam by the French Government which are recognised by the Anglo-French Agreement.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Earl PERCY, Kensington, S.): By the provisions of the Franco-Siamese Convention signed in February last, persons enjoying French protection are placed in the same position with regard to jurisdiction as French citizens. This treatment does not appear to be exceptional, as will be seen by reference to the Agreement between this country and Siam of 29th November, 1899, which contains categories of persons who are entitled to registration as British subjects and therefore under British jurisdiction in Siam. The answer to the second Question is in the negative.

The Somaliland Operations.

MR. LAMBERT: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he has any further information as to the Somali Mullah; what number of rifles and amount of ammunition has been captured from him and remain still in his possession; and whether there is a possibility of a further supply of rifles and ammunition reaching him.

EARL PERCY: The Mullah, with a small following, has been driven out of the Mijjarten territory and is now on the Sorl desert to the North-west of Illig—Illig itself being held by Ali Yusuf, Sultan of Obbia, a chief loyal to the Italian Government. Four hundred and twenty-four rifles have been captured from the Mullah, exclusive of those taken at Illig, the number of which has not yet been reported. The number of rifles at present in his possession is estimated at about 600. No exact report has been received as to ammunition, but it is believed that the Mullah has but little left. It is hoped that the precautions taken by His Majesty's Government, in conjunction with the Italian Government, will prevent any fresh supplies of rifles and ammunition from reaching the Mullah.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE (Bristol, E.) asked when the necessary Supplementary Estimates would be laid before Parliament.

*__THE DEPUTY-SPEAKER__: Order, Order! Notice must be given of that Question.

Insanitary London Post Offices.

MR. BAYLEY (Derbyshire, Chesterfield): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if his attention has been called to the sanitary condition of the Smithfield Market Branch Post Office, where the employees' retiring room is an underground cellar of such a nature that the clerks employed there are allowed as a special case to go out for dinner, and to the lack of the necessary sanitary accommodation at the Great Tower Street Branch Office; and, if so, whether he will ask for a report on the sanitary condition of these two offices.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): The question of the sanitary condition of these two offices has been fully investigated on several occasions within the last few years; but in order that I may be fully informed as to their present condition, I have asked the principal medical officer to visit them and report on their sanitary condition.

Kent Water Company's Well at Darenth.

MR. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he has received a complaint, signed by twenty inhabitant householders, in accordance with the Metropolis Water Act, 1852, that the Kent Water Company's new well at Darenth, Kent, is visibly liable to intermittent pollution by surface drainage from adjoining land; whether he has any official reports showing that there is danger of the well being polluted by surface drainage; and when an inspector will be sent to inquire into the grounds for the complaints which have been made.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.): I have received the complaint mentioned, and am in correspondence with the water company on the subject. I am expecting a communication from them, and when I receive it I will decide as to the course to be taken with respect to an inquiry. No such reports as those referred to in the Question have been made to me.

Income-Tax Abatements.

MR. J. H. LEWIS: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he will state what is the estimated total amount of abatements on account of income-tax to which persons paying income-tax are entitled (whether they claim abatement or not) during the year ending the 31st March, 1904.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY (Mr. VICTOR CAVENDISH, Derbyshire, W.): There are no data available on which to estimate the abatements to which taxpayers, who make no claim, are entitled. Particulars for the year to 31st March, 1902, as to the numbers of persons claiming abatement, and of the amounts of income relieved by abatement in the several classes, will be found on page 213 of the last Annual Report of the Commissioners of Inland Revenue (Cd. 1717). The same particulars cannot yet be given for any later year.

Highland Crofting Counties—Inspectors of the Poor.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if he will state whether there is an age limit for the appointment of candidates to the office of inspector of poor in the Highland crofting counties; and is there a medical examination as to physical fitness.

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. SCOTT DICKSON, Glasgow, Bridgton): The answer to both Queries is in the negative.

MR. WEIR: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that a number of men far advanced in years are pitchforked into these offices who are utterly unfit for the work?

MR. SCOTT DICKSON: I am not aware of that.

Fishery Researches—"Goldseeker's" Hauls of Fish.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if he will state what quantity of fish, caught by the Fishery Board's scientific research boat "Goldseeker," was sold during the month of April, the names of the places where the sales were effected, the money realised, and how accounted for.

MR. SCOTT DICKSON: About 156 boxes of fish caught by the "Goldseeker" were sold during the month of April, three of the sales were effected at Aberdeen and two at Newhaven; the money realised amounted to £102 13s. 5d., and this amount was deposited in the Bank of Scotland and will be accounted for to the Treasury. I may add that the quantity caught in April was quite exceptional.

Island of Lewis and the Equivalent Grant.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether he has received a memorial from the Lewis District Committee, pointing out that the allocation of the equivalent grant for education purposes will deprive the Lewis District Committee of the fund out of which the footpaths and footbridges connecting townships with the public schools have hitherto been maintained; and, seeing that children will be unable to get to school if these footpaths and footbridges are allowed to fall out of repair, will he state how he proposes to provide for their maintenance; and will he say what answer he proposes to make to the committee's memorial in favour of the equivalent grant being still administered by county councils in the Highland crofting counties.

MR. SCOTT DICKSON: I have received the memorial referred to by the hon. Member, and it has been under consideration. I do not think it expedient, in anticipation of the Committee stage, to discuss a provision of the Bill (as to which I observe that the hon. Member has put down an Amendment) by way of answer to a Question.

Irish Development Grant.

MR. JOHN REDMOMD (Waterford): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has yet come to a decision as to the items to be included in the Supplementary Estimate for the Irish Development Grant Fund which he promised; and when he proposes to place that Estimate upon the Table.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): I propose to retain the items in the Estimate at present before the House. In respect, however, of the provision proposed for the improvement of the Tralee and Dingle Railway, the application of this money is dependent upon a satisfactory settlement being arrived at with the Great Southern and Western Railway Company on the merits of the scheme. With respect to new items, I would point out that sums not expended in any year pass out of the Guarantee Fund. It would be a mistake, under the circumstances, to authorise expenditure on insufficiently considered projects. This reservation, however, does not apply to the cost of reducing the existing average required for an assistant school teacher from sixty to fifty; but it does, in my judgment, apply to other items of expenditure on education—for example, the provision of free homes for provincial training colleges, which can only be considered as part of the general question of educational reform. There is another item which might be charged to the Development Grant, namely, a dredger. I am unable to name a day for the introduction of the revised Estimate.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: As this is a matter of enormous importance to Ireland, I trust the House will kindly allow me to put a supplementary Question. The right hon. Gentleman has said that sums not spent in the current year will pass out of the Guarantee Fund. Does the right hon. Gentleman mean that they are no longer liable to charges by the Treasury in respect of the Land Act of 1903? and, further, with reference to the training colleges, was he to be understood as expressing the opinion that in the educational settlement which he seems to foreshadow it will be a fair thing that the training colleges should receive money towards their building fund?

MR. WYNDHAM: My reply to the first Question is in the affirmative. For example, if £100,000 is not expended during this year, but goes over, it will pass out of the Guarantee Fund, and no charge in connection with land purchase will affect that £100,000. As to the second Question, without pledging myself in the matter, I frankly admit that the question of giving further assistance to the training colleges is one that will have to be considered in any attempt to deal with education.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: With regard to the item of £20,000 in the present Estimate for the Dingle and Tralee Railway, do the Government intend to maintain that, subject to an arrangement with the Great South and Western Railway on the merits of the scheme? Does that mean that the right hon. Gentleman differentiates this scheme from the Rosslare and Fishguard Railway?

MR. WYNDHAM replied in the affirmative.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Do the Government intend to enter into no negotiations touching the Rosslare and Fishguard scheme?

Mr. WYNDHAM: I do not.

Mr. KILBRIDE (Kildare, S.): What about the dredger?

Mr. WYNDHAM: It will be available for all parts of Ireland.

Achonry School Managers.

Mr. O'DOWD (Sligo, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, seeing the estate on which the schools at Achonry, county Sligo, are situate has passed out of the hands of Captain Armstrong and into the hands of the Congested Districts Board, his right to nominate a manager, which arose from his ownership of the lands on which the schools stand, has also passed into the hands of the Congested Districts Board.

Mr. WYNDHAM: I have nothing at present to add to my reply to the hon. Member's previous Question of Monday last on the subject†. The matter is receiving attention.

Evicted Tenants in County Kerry.

Mr. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state how many evicted tenants there are in the county Kerry; and how many have been restored under the Land Act of 1903.

Mr. WYNDHAM: There is no official information of the number of evicted tenants in Kerry. 346 applications for reinstatement have been received from the county, and these will be taken into consideration as soon as the Estates Commissioners have acquired untenanted land in the county.

Mr. THOMAS O'DONNELL: Is it not the fact that although 346 applications have been received no single evicted tenant has yet been reinstated?

Mr. WYNDHAM: It is not possible to deal with these cases until the Commissioners have obtained untenanted land.

Mr. THOMAS O'DONNELL: But how about the men who have applied to be reinstated on their own lands?

Mr. WYNDHAM: It all depends whether or not the land is tenanted.

Irish National Schools—Building Plans.

Mr. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Board of National Education has decided on the new plans for schools, seeing that the matter has now been under consideration for a long period; and, if so, can he say whether information has been given to managers throughout the country who have been handicapped by the delay that has taken place.

Mr. JOSEPH DEVLIN (Kilkenny, N.): At the same time, may I ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the number of applications that have been made by managers to the Commissioners of National Education for building grants since 1901; the number of grants made, and the number of applications unattended to; whether he is aware that, notwithstanding the fact that several of the old buildings have been condemned by the Board's inspectors, a number of applications are still unattended to; and whether he can state when the new plans will be ready and what is the cause of the delay.

Mr. WYNDHAM: I will at the same time reply to both Questions. Two hundred and seventy-two applications for building grants have been received from managers since 1st January, 1901. Grants have been made in seventy of these cases; twenty-two applications were rejected; twenty-two were withdrawn; in 107 cases the applicants have decided to await the issue of the revised plans; and in the remaining fifty-one cases inquiries are proceeding. No applications have been unattended to by the Commissioners. The Financial Secretary to the Treasury stated on the 26th May last year† that a decision on the recommendations of the Committee on Building Grants would be deferred until the inquiry into the educational system in Ireland is completed. The Report on that inquiry is at present engaging the consideration of the Government.

---

† See page 767.

† See (4) *Debates* cxxii., 1791.

Kellysgrove Bog—Turf Thefts.

Mr. ROCHE (Galway, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if his attention has been called to the action of the Ballinasloe Petty Sessions Court, who recently sentenced two women to one month's imprisonment with hard labour for taking a bag of turf valued at 3d. from Kellysgrove Bog; and whether, as it was stated in evidence that this turf was merely of a nominal value, and no previous charges had been made against these women, he will advise the remission of this sentence.

Mr. WYNDHAM: I am informed that there have been many complaints of the larceny of turf in this district, and that the chairman of the rural district council stated from the Bench that these larcenies had become very prevalent. It does not come within my province to advise the remission of a term of imprisonment. Any application in this respect should be addressed to the Lord-Lieutenant.

Mount Bellew Technical School.

Mr. ROCHE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a technical school for boys was built at Mount Bellew, county Galway, by Very Rev. Canon Ronayne, partly by aid of a grant from the Education Board, partly from local resources, and partly by moneys provided by himself; that the county committee, at the end of the year 1902–3, voted a sum of £32 for equipment purposes, which was set down in the scheme for 1903–4 with sanction of the Department; that this school has been visited by the inspector, and no exception taken to the equipment; that the county committee have repeatedly reminded the Department of their recommendation to sanction the payment of the equipment provided; and whether, in view of these facts, the Department will now sanction the payment of the money expended.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The facts are substantially as stated, except that the school is a national, not a technical one, and that the scheme contained a statement that the proposal to spend £32 on equipment would be considered after a visit and report by an inspector. There is no need to equip this school as a fixed centre of technical instruction, as the county committee supply the itinerant teachers, by whom the classes have been taught, with the necessary requisites for class instruction. The Department is not prepared, in the circumstances, to sanction the expenditure.

Deportation of Irish Paupers.

Mr. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state how long Frank Milner, for whose removal from the West Derby Union to the Mountmellick Union a warrant was issued by the magistrates sitting at the Police Court, Dale Street, Liverpool, on the 12th of April last, has resided in England.

Mr. WYNDHAM: This is a Question that should properly be addressed to my right hon. friend the President of the English Local Government Board. However, I am making inquiry, and will communicate the result to the hon. Member.

Proposed Recreation Ground at Mallow.

Mr. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Cork County, N.E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state why the Local Government Board have refused to grant the application of the Urban Council of Mallow for a Provisional Order to enable them to acquire land for the purpose of a recreation ground for the use of the inhabitants of the town and urban district, having regard to the fact that the estimated rates of the town have been decreased by twopence in the pound, and adequate provision has been made for new works, including working-class lodging-houses, improvement of the water supply and sewerage, and for such portion of the cost and maintenance of the recreation ground as might possibly fall upon the rates; and whether the

Local Government Board will reconsider the matter and accede to the application of the urban council.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The Provisional Order was refused because the necessity for the proposed recreation ground was not established at the local inquiry. The Board has not sanctioned any scheme for the improvement of the water supply and sewerage, both of which are in a very defective condition and in urgent need of improvement. These are matters that call for prior treatment. Moreover, the evidence taken at the inquiry showed that, contrary to the belief of the district council, the cost of providing a recreation ground would fall almost entirely on the rates.

Earl of Kenmare's Estate.

Mr. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been directed to the offer of the Earl of Kenmare to sell his estate to his tenants by townlands; whether the Estates Commissioners have any power to consider such a scheme involving separate bargaining by sections of tenants and the payment of different prices for sections of an estate; and whether he can take any steps to bring about a sale to those tenants at reasonable prices.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The Commissioners have not received, so far, any application in respect of this property. They have power, in their discretion, to declare a convenient area of a large property to be a separate estate.

Mr. MURPHY: Having regard to the unrest and agitation caused by this and similar points, will the right hon. Gentleman reconsider his attitude and try to give more satisfactory replies?

[No answer was returned.]

Irish Local Government Board Report.

Mr. SHEEHAN (Cork County, Mid): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state when the Annual Report of the Local Government Board for the year ending 31st March, 1904, will be laid upon the Table of the House; at what time are these Reports usually published; is there delay in their publication; if so, to what is it attributable; and, seeing how important it is that the Report for the past year should be in the hands of Members before the introduction of the Labourers Bill, will he take steps to secure its immediate publication.

Mr. WYNDHAM: It is not possible at present to name a date for the presentation of the Report for 1903–4, but its preparation will be pressed forward and no avoidable delay will take place in completing it. The Report for 1900–1 was presented in August, 1902; that for 1901–2 in May, 1903; and the Report for 1902–3 last month. Any delay that may have taken place previously in presenting the Report is attributable to the operation of the Act of 1898, which revolutionised the system of the keeping of the accounts by local authorities, besides calling hundreds of local bodies into existence. A Return is in preparation and will shortly be laid on the Table in continuation of the Return granted last year on the Motion of the hon. Member for West Kerry. This Return will give full information in respect of labourers' cottages made up to the 31st March, 1904.

Trinity College Head Rents.

Mr. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Trinity College, Dublin, have demanded, as head landlords, twenty-six to twenty-seven years purchase from Mr. Blacker Douglas, who is a middleman holding under Trinity College and whose property is situate near Listowel, North Kerry; and, if so, whether he can state what steps he has taken or will take in connection with the price demanded by Trinity College for the redemption of their head rent; and whether he can state the average number of years purchase fixed by the Land Commission in past years for the redemption of head rents.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The Land Commissioners have no knowledge of the fact alleged in the first part of the Question. Under Section 64 of the Act of 1903 the value of a superior interest is fixed, in the event of the failure of the parties to agree to a redemption price, by the Judicial Commissioner or the Land Judge. Under former Purchase Acts the redemption price of head rents was fixed by arbitration, unless the parties agreed. In cases fixed by arbitration the price has varied from thirty to eighteen times the rent.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): Have the Estates Commissioners in considering this application any power to consider the special grant of £5,000 made to Trinity College with a view to facilitating operations under the Land Act?

MR. WYNDHAM: I do not see where the Estates Commissioners come in. If the parties cannot agree as to the value of the head rent they will go before the Land Court.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: But in the event of non-agreement and the Land Court or Land Commission being called in as arbitrators, have they no power to consider the annual grant made by the House to Trinity College for this express purpose?

MR. WYNDHAM: I cannot say whether that ought or ought not to be taken into account.

MR. FLAVIN: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the whole interest of Mr. Blacker Douglas, the middleman, will be absorbed if Trinity College do not abate their demand?

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: I shall call attention to this matter on the Land Commission Vote.

MR. FLAVIN: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that Mr. Blacker Douglas, although willing, cannot sell to the tenants because of the exorbitant price demanded by Trinity College?

[No answer was returned.]

Marquess of Drogheda's Kildare Property

MR. KILBRIDE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the tenants on the Marquess of Drogheda's property in Kildare have agreed to buy their holdings at a certain number of years purchase; and, if so, whether, before the sale is sanctioned by the Estates Commissioners, due inquiry will be made with regard to the evicted tenants on the estate with a view to their reinstatement.

MR. WYNDHAM: No application in respect of this property is before the Estates Commissioners. Any applications made by evicted tenants for reinstatement will be considered.

Police Arrangements in County Fermanagh.

MR. JORDAN (Fermanagh, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if the constabulary have been permanently removed from the village of Blacklion, in the county of Cavan, to the village of Belcoo, in the county of Fermanagh; and, if so, will he consider the advisability of abolishing also as unnecessary the constabulary stations, or either of them, in the rural districts of Carngreen and Letterbreen, in the county of Fermanagh.

MR. WYDNHAM: The police station at Blacklion has been abolished and some of the police stationed there were removed to Belcoo. It is not considered desirable at present to disestablish either of the police stations at Carngreen or Letterbreen.

Architect of College of Science, Dublin.

MR. MOONEY (Dublin Co., S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if the Treasury, when making the appointment of architect for the proposed new buildings of the College of Science, Dublin, consulted with the Board of Works, Ireland, and the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction; and, if so, did these bodies, or either of them, suggest that an Irish architect should be employed for this work.

MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH: I have already stated that the responsibility for this appointment rests with the Board of Treasury; and I am unable to add anything further as to the selection.

In reply to a further Question, Mr. VICTOR CAVENDISH said communications passed between the different Departments on the subject, but the Treasury accepted full responsibility for the appointment.

MR. MOONEY: I shall put another Question on this.

Valentia Harbour Telegraph Station.

MR. BOLAND: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he is now in a position to state what steps have been taken to continue the telegraph office at Valentia Harbour, county Kerry, during the fishery season.

LORD STANLEY: It has not been proposed to open a temporary telegraph office this year at Valentia Harbour. When such an office was opened it was at the request and expense of the Great Southern and Western Railway Company, but this year the company have not proposed the service.

MR. FLAVIN: Is this one of the boons conferred on the locality by the railway amalgamation?

LORD STANLEY: I know nothing of that.

MR. FLAVIN: Is the noble Lord aware that this is one of the most important fishing districts in the West of Ireland? Will he reconsider this?

LORD STANLEY: I have had no request for the opening of the office, but if I receive one I will certainly consider it.

Derry Shipbuilding Yard.

MR. MURPHY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that there is a shipbuilding yard in the city of Derry; and that, owing to absence of work, the yard is of little value to the locality; and, if so, whether he can see his way to recommend the Navy Department to distribute a reasonable share of work to Derry in future.

MR. PRETYMAN: The existence and facilities of this firm are known, and have been noted at the Admiralty in the event of repairs within their capacity being required to vessels in that locality. Any application that they may send to tender for such work will be favourably considered.

5th Battalion Royal Irish Rifles.

MR. WOOD (Down, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he has received any communication from the Downpatrick Town Commissioner as to the training of the 5th Battalion Royal Irish Rifles at Downpatrick; can he state why this regiment is not trained at Downpatrick, which is the headquarters of the battalion; and if he can give an undertaking that in future the training will be carried out at Downpatrick.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Mr. BROMLEY DAVENPORT, Cheshire, Macclesfield): No communication has been received at the War Office from the Downpatrick Town Commissioner. The matter is one for the General Officer Commanding concerned to decide, with whose discretion I am not prepared to interfere.

Irish Legislation.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can state approximately when the Second Reading will be taken of the Irish Land Act Amending Bill and the Labourers Bill.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): The hon. Member is aware that it is impossible to take these Bills before the Whitsuntide holidays, and he understands that it would be generally inconvenient to take them in the week in which the House reassembles. I am, however, extremely desirous to pass the Second Reading as early as I can, but I do not know that I can make any specific statement as to dates.

British Guiana Immigration Ordinance.

SIR HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether The British Guiana Immigration Ordinance, 1891, was enacted by the local Legislature with the approval of the Colonial Office in 1891; whether its operation was suspended at the request of the Government of India until an officer appointed by them had visited the

Colony; whether, after the Government of India (during the Viceroyalty of Lord Lansdowne) had expressed their approval of the Ordinance, it came into force in 1894; and whether the Ordinance of 1891 was not a consolidation of all the then existing Ordinances relating to Indian immigration into British Guiana.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The Ordinance to which the right hon. Gentleman refers was enacted in 1891 by the local Legislature. It was not, however, previously submitted or approved by the Colonial Office, or by the then Secretary for the Colonies, Lord Knutsford. It was suspended by Lord Knutsford, but not, as I am informed, on the initiative of the Indian Government, which appears to be the suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman. It was first allowed to come into operation by Mr. Gladstone's Government in 1894. The Act was both consolidating and amending.

SIR HENRY FOWLER: I do not propose now to enter into any arguments as to the facts, but will the right hon. Gentleman make arrangements after Whitsuntide for the putting down of the Colonial Office Vote on an early day in order to give me an early opportunity to repudiate on behalf of Lord Ripon and myself the charges so freely made against us in relation to this Ordinance.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I shall be delighted to do my best to arrange Supply to meet the views of the right hon. Gentleman, who, I suppose, represents his colleagues and a large body of opinion on the other side of the House. But I do not quite know what are the charges to which he refers.

SIR HENRY FOWLER: I refer to the speech in the Albert Hall.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Oh!

SIR HENRY FOWLER: Will the right hon. Gentleman see that a copy of the regulations under which the Ordinance was put in force is laid on the Table?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman will consult with my right hon. friend the Colonial Secretary as to the exact Papers he desires.

The Cunard Subsidy.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I desire to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he has been able to make arrangements for discussion on the Cunard Money Committee. A large sum of money is involved, and many Members on both sides of the House desire to take part in the discussion.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not know what the limits of the discussion on the Resolution will be; but the House will remember that all that now has to be done is to provide the money to carry out an obligation for which this House, and not the Government alone, is responsible. I cannot promise a day before the Whitsuntide holidays.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: The Resolution of the House to which the right hon. Gentleman refers was taken on the last day of the session, when only ninety-two Members on the Government side of the House were present.

The Tibetan Expedition.

MR. FLYNN: I desire to ask leave to move the adjournment of the House in order to call attention to a definite matter of urgent public importance—namely, the announcement just made that the Tibetan expedition has been ordered to Lhasa.

*THE DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I think the Motion of the hon. Member is covered by one appearing in the Orderbook in the name of the hon. Member for Hampstead and asserting that "it is not desirable to send an armed Mission to a friendly State in order to secure the fulfilment of a treaty."

MR. FLYNN: May I submit that my Motion is not covered by that of the hon. Member for Hampstead, because the expedition to Lhasa has only just been sanctioned. It is a new and unexpected development of the policy of the Government, and in direct contradiction to the statement of the Prime Minister.

MR. LOUGH: May I also point out that the Motion of the hon. Member for Hampstead refers to an expedition going into a friendly State. The hon. Member for Cork wishes to raise the question of the advance of an expedition already in the friendly State.

*THE DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The greater contains the less. The Motion of the hon. Member for Hampstead takes a wider view than that of the hon. Member for North Cork—that is all.

MR. LAMBERT: Will the First Lord of the Treasury give a day for the discussion of the new policy?

*THE DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The hon. Member must give notice of that Question.

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Mr. HALSEY reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Member from the Standing Committee on Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufactures—Mr. Grant Lawson, and had appointed in substitution: Mr. Hare.

Report to lie upon the Table.

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Mr. HALSEY reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Member from the Standing Committee on Law, and Courts of Justice, and Legal Procedure—Mr. Solicitor-General; and had appointed in substitution: Mr. Attorney-General.

Report to lie upon the Table.

SUPPLY [9TH ALLOTTED DAY].

(Considered in Committee.)

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1904-5.

CLASS II.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £10,259, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Office of the Commissioners in Lunacy in England."

SIR JOHN TUKE (Edinburgh and St. Andrews Universities) said he had moved this reduction in order to draw attention to the inadequate constitution of the English Lunacy Commission, and to certain defects in action consequent upon this inadequacy. In order to guard himself, he wished to say in the first place that he did not desire to attack individuals. He believed that the various members of the Commission were eminent and hard-working men, and that any imperfection in work followed entirely on the paucity of their numbers. What was the constitution of the Commission? It was presided over by an unpaid chairman, and there were four unpaid Commissioners. There were three medical and three legal Commissioners paid at the rate of £1,500 per annum. The duties of the unpaid Commissioners were confined entirely to the office. The main duty of the paid Commissioners was to visit and report on 114,000 registered lunatics in England and Wales. In order to develop his argument, he trusted he might be allowed to compare the condition of things in Scotland. In Scotland there was one unpaid chairman, two medical Commissioners with £1,200 per annum, two deputy Commissioners at £600, and two unpaid legal Commissioners. The duty of this Board was to supervise the interests of 14,500 registered insane persons. Thus, in England, three medical Commissioners supervised 114,000 patients; whereas, in Scotland, four medical Commissioners supervised 14,500. Putting it otherwise, in England there was one Commissioner to 38,000 lunatics; in Scotland one Commissioner to 3,622; thus, the supervising power in Scotland was ten times more than in England. He might be told that there was another supervising body in England—the Chancery Visitors in Lunacy. But they did not come into the equation in any way whatever. Their duties were confined to looking after the interests of wards in Chancery, and had nothing to do with the discipline or management of lunatic asylums as a whole. They might be put out of count. With these figures they were forced to one of two conclusions; either that Scotland was ridiculously overmanned or that England was seriously undermanned. He was going to say scandalously undermanned, and on the whole he felt justified in using that expression. He hoped he would be permitted to adduce the result of forty years experience to show that Scotland was in lunacy matters not overmanned, and he would adduce four reasons gained from personal experience to support his opinion.

First as to the character of the supervision. In Scotland each lunatic resident in an asylum was visited twice in each year by a medical Commissioner who performed his duty thoroughly. In England there was only one visitation except in private asylums. He was going to say leisurely, were it not that that expression might lead to misconception; but the fact was, that twice in each year each patient had an opportunity of laying his case before the Commission who attended to it carefully, and gave it real consideration. In the second place, he wished to adduce the fact that no action at law had for forty years come before the Scottish Courts, either under the Lunacy Acts or under the common law. Thirdly, they never experienced lunacy scares in Scotland. They had no scandals and outbursts of popular feeling or adverse Press comments. Fourthly, he was warranted in the assertion that there was as much public confidence in asylums and their administration in Scotland as there was in general infirmaries and hospitals, and that was saying a good deal. All the conditions engendered a feeling of confidence between the Board of Lunacy and the asylum authorities. Commissioners would act at once should occasion arise. They would take steps to abate any scandal, but in his long experience he had never known of any serious case demanding intervention. And further, there was a confidence established between the Commissioners and the asylum authorities on the one hand, and the public on the other. Under all these circumstances they were able to work elastically under much milder law than existed in England; and this in its turn worked beneficially for the insane, for, after all, he thought, it would not be gainsaid that their benefit was, or should be, the first object of legislation. The lunatic was not made for the law, but the law for the lunatic.

Now, on the face of it, he thought it would be generally admitted that it was physically impossible for the same kind and quality of supervision to be carried out in England as in Scotland. Was it possible for a Commissioner, however competent, distinguished, and hard-working, to overcome ten times the amount of work done by his brother across the Tweed and get equally good results? It was curious and interesting to note the fact that this numerical inadequacy of the English Commission was getting worse and worse. He did not propose going back into the history of the dark ages or the eighteenth century when humanitarian feeling had not been aroused, as shown by the state of our prisons, by the condition of our madhouses, and by the cruel administration of the criminal law. Public feeling was aroused at the end of the century by the great Frenchman Pinel, and by a sturdy Quaker of York whose name he had the honour to bear, although he could not prove any close relationship. Partly as a result of their action, in 1832 five physicians and two barristers were appointed as a sort of Commission, and these numbers were increased in 1842 to seven physicians and four barristers. Still things did not work satisfactorily, and on the suggestion of Lord Ashley, subsequently Earl of Shaftesbury, a Royal Commission was appointed, on the recommendation of which the present Board of Commissioners in Lunacy was established in 1845. He was quite content to support his argument from that date. Under that Act the Commission was established exactly on the lines on which it existed at the present day. In 1842 there was reason to believe, although accurate statistics were not available, the number of lunatics in England and Wales was 25,000. Accurate statistics were only arrived at in 1859, when 37,000 lunatics were on the register. In 1870 there were 54,000, and in 1903, 114,000. Thus, medical Commissioners had to do four times the amount of work at the present day that they had to perform at the date of the establishment of the Commission. This stagnation must, he thought, appear extraordinary to the House, which he could not help thinking would be anxious to increase the number.

Now he would be reminded, of course, that besides three medical Commissioners, there were three legal Commissioners. He admitted to the full that legal Commissioners were absolutely necessary on the Commission. They could not be dispensed with as representing the law and the public. In the board room their presence was of the utmost importance. But what was their chief duty? It was to visit asylums along with the medical Commissioner. The legal Commissioner and medical Commissioner hunted in couples, the legal Commissioner knowing nothing more of medicine or of lunacy, or of asylum administration than policeman X. What was the theory of this visitation? It was a remnant of old tradition, the idea being that during visits at an asylum some points of law might arise which could only be settled by the legal Commissioner. He challenged the Commission to adduce a single case within, let him say, the last forty years, in which such an emergency had arisen. Any irregularity could be detected by the Commissioner and be reported and considered in the board room. As a matter of fact, the legal Commissioner only stood by. Patients were not presented individually, but *en masse*. He wrote a report, and, in fact, performed the work of a clerk. He had heard it suggested that he superintended the actions of the medical Commissioner, but this, he need hardly say, was a ridiculous assertion. He was useless for inspection purposes, he was an anachronism, and reminded him of the old story of the new commandant at Potsdam, who, on going his rounds, found a sentry in a curiously out-of-the-way position. He asked what was the object of this sentry. No one could answer him till the files of the orderly room were looked out and it was found that some fifty years before a Royal Princess had planted a tree which she desired to be taken care of and a sentry was posted. The Princess and the tree were both dead, but the sentry remained. He was convinced of the uselessness of these officers by his Scottish experience. There the legal Commissioners confined themselves to the board room and the inspection was carried out by one visiting medical Commissioner. He might be told that the inspection of a legal Commissioner gave confidence to the public. He had no hesitation in saying that there was not one in 10,000, perhaps not in 100,000, of the public that knew of his existence. As he had said, the legal Commissioner was an absolutely necessary component part of the Commission in the board room, but he was utterly useless in respect of inspection.

He would ask the House to consider whether the performance of such duties as he had stated demanded the existence of three officers costing £4,500 per annum. Surely one or two standing counsels at £500 a year each, or, as in Scotland, without salary, would be sufficient, and he was assured that in Scotland there was no shirking of work, no perfunctory performance of duties of those unpaid officials. But he doubted very much whether they would ever see these officers extinguished, for they were likely to exist so long as the Lord Chancellor had in his gift three fat posts to distribute amongst barristers who from advancing years or for any cause desired to relinquish the active exercise of their profession. Now he believed, in fact he knew, an office undermanned to the extent that this was must work in wooden fashion. It must work bureaucratically, using the term in its worst sense. There was no sympathy, no elasticity; and, moreover, it worked under a hard law, and notwithstanding the rigidity of law and administration it did not command the same public confidence as bodies in Scotland.

The first step to obtain public confidence was to establish thorough supervision. That could be done by breaking England and Wales up into some four or five different districts, with a registered Commissioner or Commissioners in each. He would not say that they had better Commissioners in Scotland, although they had many of great distinction. The success of their Commission was not dependent merely on this relative numerical superiority, but on the fact that Scotland was a small country, where practically everybody knew everybody. If England were broken up into four or five districts with resident Commissioners in each, these Commissioners would, by the mere force of propinquity, know the character of each institution under its jurisdiction, and obtain information as to the extent of unregistered and illegal establishments. As an illustration of what might be and was going on under existing circumstances, he would adduce the case of a man with no medical qualifications who was prosecuted early this year for maintaining an illegal establishment. He had continued doing this for thirteen years, and when detected he had seven patients, all of whom were in a most miserable condition. This was not a single case. This could not have occurred in Scotland or in any district with a limited area. He deplored for humanitarian and economic reasons the rapid increase of lunacy in Great Britain. The rate ran up by thousands a year and had more than doubled in thirty years. In England, in the decade 1893-1903, the annual average increase had been 2,414. Whilst admitting that causes other than that which he was about to adduce had been in action, the reason to which he was about to draw attention for the increase of lunacy was the main one. They were manufacturing chronic lunacy day by day in their asylums, and the fault did not lie at the door of the medical authorities of those institutions, than whom no more earnest and hard-working men existed. This was inevitable under the present condition of the law, and his argument was that they could not hope for any relaxation in this respect until public confidence was established, and the first step in this direction was the one he had indicated.

It was not his intention to deliver a lecture on the nature and treatment of the diseases comprised under the generic term of insanity. He wished to point out that doctors were precluded from treating the diseases adequately during the two critical stages of the complaint—the beginning and the end of each case. They were able to do so properly and efficiently amongst the moneyed classes, and it would not be difficult to prove that, as a consequence, in these classes there was no increase of lunacy. They could treat them at their own homes or elsewhere, supply them with nurses and all the necessary accessories, but this meant money; but with the poorer classes they were obliged to leave matters to drift, and that in face of symptoms they knew must inevitably result in acute insanity. They had to wait till the case was so pronounced as to warrant certification, thus losing the most valuable time during which the disease was most readily amenable to treatment. If of every 100 cases presenting themselves they excluded twenty as incurable, as *opprobria medicinæ*, of the eighty left 60 per cent. were amenable to treatment and that without asylum treatment. He could only adduce a concrete case in support of this assertion. An institution for the treatment of incipient cases of insanity had been established by the Glasgow Town Council, and he found by their Report that between 1890 and 1903, 70 per cent. of cases treated were discharged cured. Acute alcoholism—in itself a ripe cause of insanity—but over and above a large number of incipient cases were treated to satisfactory conclusion without being sent to asylum. The London County Council was of the same mind. So convinced was that body of the necessity of such treatment that it promoted a Bill, introduced in another place last year for the establishment of houses for this class of patient. The County Council sought for powers exercised in Scotland and not in England. In Scotland they were prepared for the increase of such establishments in consequence of general confidence in the Lunacy Board, but he doubted whether they were in England.

He would allude very shortly to the other stage of the disease. A patient sent to an asylum was placed under the best conditions for recovery, but on his being discharged as recovered he was in many cases utterly neglected. No term of convalescence was allowed, no after care was possible except such as was afforded by one association in London, and accordingly large numbers relapsed and the asylum's recovery rate of, say 40 per cent., became in practice reduced to something like 25. Until they ceased manufacturing dementia in the way he had explained, the number of lunatics must increase, and no material change could be brought about until confidence was established. The first means to that end was an efficient Lunacy Commission. They would go on building asylum after asylum for the reception of chronic cases. He gave way to no man in sympathy for the insane and in sympathy with their friends and relatives. But it was his duty to say that his opinion was that gross extravagance existed in asylum construction. He had conducted with good results an asylum in Scotland which cost about £200 per bed. Now they heard of £350 to £500, and even more, being expended, and this extravagance could only be arrested and controlled by efficient supervision. He did not wish to weaken his argument, but he had to confess that in Scotland they were not altogether free of charge. The whole lunacy question of Great Britain required examination—England mainly, Scotland to a rather less extent; and to this end he appealed to the Home Secretary with all diffidence to appoint a Select Committee to consider the question as a whole. It was no good undertaking it piecemeal. He confidently predicted that if such a Commission was established, very material and important changes would be recommended and, he trusted, acted on.

He had adduced certain reasons which sufficiently warranted his making this appeal, but he had one more. During the last twenty-five or thirty years a vast change had come over the general conception of insanity, certainly as regards the medical profession, and he believed to a certain extent the public. The medical profession had advanced along with the advance in general medicine. As regards insanity it was difficult to express what this change was tersely, but in semi-technical terms he might say the insane person was no longer regarded as a psychological curiosity but as a pathological entity. He or she was a a very sick man or woman demanding hospital treatment, treatment which was denied by every general hospital or infirmary in the Kingdom.

He feared he had trespassed too long on the indulgence of the Committee, but he felt justified in doing so in that the matter was one of national importance. He was no enthusiast. He spoke with deliberation from very long experience, and he knew that he should be supported by the great mass of his profession. He had no eloquence to depend on in advancing his claims except the eloquence of facts and figures. Again he begged to ask the Home Secretary to carefully consider the position. If the right hon. Gentleman would accede to his request, the right hon. Gentleman would do much to alleviate the most wretched and dire disease which man was heir to—a disease which more than any other affected the happiness of friends and relatives. He asked the right hon. Gentleman to remember that the nation was doing its best to stamp out tuberculosis and to eradicate cancer, but they were not doing their duty in respect of a disease which affected three per thousand of the country, and which if not arrested consigned its victim to a living tomb. He had spoken under a deep sense of responsibility. He was but a humble private Member of this House, but he thought he might say that no one in it was so intimately acquainted with the subject, and had he not done as he had done, he felt that he should have failed in his duty to the public.

*SIR **MICHAEL FOSTER** (London University) associated himself warmly with the efforts of the previous speaker to obtain an improvement in the lunacy laws. The urgent necessity for a large increase of the Commissioners in Lunacy was beyond doubt. Whether there should be an increase in the number of head Commissioners or in the number of assistant Commissioners was a matter of detail, but there ought to be an increase in the number of medical Commissioners. It should be remembered that when the lunacy laws were introduced they were more or less based on the view that the case of a person of unsound mind was a hopeless one, and their main purpose was to protect the lunatic from ill-treatment, to protect the public against the lunatic, and to prevent a sane man from being taken for a lunatic. That *motif* still obtained, and the legal rather than the medical aspect was put in the fore part of our legislation. In no branch of science had there been greater progress during the last generation than in the knowledge of the brain and the central nervous system. That wonderful web of delicate fibre and cells was being gradually unravelled, and day by day they were getting a command over the brain which was unknown when the Lunacy Acts were introduced. Though medical science had reduced other diseases, notably tuberculosis, lunacy, if anything, was on the increase. Where was the fault? The fault was not in science. Science was ready to do all it could. One fault was the present state of the lunacy laws. If these did not hinder they certainly did not facilitate the application of science to lunacy, especially in the early stages. Great changes were needed. Besides an increase in the number of Commissioners, there was one very great change needed, and that was in the making known of cases of insanity in the early stages. At present an insane person could not be brought adequately under treatment without the certificate of two medical men, and that meant a petition and a declaration and a magistrate's order. That was virtually an advertisement of insanity, and as such it stood in the way of the desire of medical men to apply medical science to the cure of insanity in its early stages. The friends of the patient refused to avail themselves of the opportunity because the advertisement brought a stigma to the patient. These things were done much better in Scotland, where on the certificate of a responsible medical man placed in the hands of a householder, an insane person could be kept in a private house under proper treatment. Why should that not apply in England? We now had notification of infectious diseases, and there would be no difficulty in the notification of a change in the central nervous system; and mere notification would be a very different thing from the advertisement of the present system. The certificate declared a person to be of unsound mind, and that was interpreted as meaning that the person was incapable of taking care of himself. That was not a true view of the case. Insanity covered a whole group of changes in the central nervous system, some slight and others dangerous, but under the present system all cases had to be treated in exactly the same way. That ought not to be so, and he joined his hon. friend in urging most strongly on the Attorney-General the desirability of some inquiry into the whole matter.

DR. FARQUHARSON (Aberdeenshire, W.) said that in past days he had acted as godfather to this question in the House, but now that the real father had appeared he would gracefully take a back seat and follow him in advocating a complete and expeditious inquiry into the great questions connected with lunacy. He would prefer a Royal Commission to a Select Committee as being a more dignified and proper method of conducting so important an investigation, and from what he had heard from different authorities he had come to the conclusion that the case for inquiry was complete. Twelve years had elapsed since a consolidating Act was passed, and in 1900, by some extraordinary Parliamentary accident, a Lunacy Bill slipped through both Houses without a word of discussion. The Bill brought forward by the Lord Chancellor four years ago contained admirable provisions suggested by the Lunacy Commissioners, including one which proposed to extend to England the beneficent arrangement at present enjoyed in Scotland, by which cases on the border line of insanity were allowed to be treated in private homes for a period of six months, thus tiding over the time during which successful treatment was possible. By that system many persons were restored who would probably have become permanently insane if they had been sent to a lunatic asylum. There were many questions for consideration, such as the waste of public money under the present system, and whether lunacy was really on the increase, or whether it was merely that cases were diagnosed earlier and thus brought under the notice of the authorities at an earlier stage. Another question for inquiry was the necessity of having a variety of public institutions in which cases on the border-line of insanity might be carefully treated and studied, so as to give them the best chances of recovery. Insanity ought to be considered, not as a mysterious dispensation of Providence, a sort of judgment brought upon people by some malign influence from above or from below, but as a disease, and it should be studied in the same way as any other disease. Above all, they should wipe away once and for ever the wretched superstition that there was something discreditable attaching to a man or his family if he should unfortunately come under the designation of "mad." There ought to be established special hospitals, or, at any rate, special wards, for the study of lunacy, and special pathological institutions. The London County Council, with great liberality and energy, and in a scientific spirit, had started a pathological institute, under the care and the superintendence of first-class scientific men, and a splendid scientific work was being done. The only drawback to that institution was its distance from London. It ought to be brought to the Metropolis, so that scientific men could attend day by day, and students hour by hour, to study the cases and the pathological results.

Reference had been made to the Scotch domestic system, under which one-fifth of the insane people were boarded out in private houses, instead of being herded in lunatic asylums where they must be crystallised in their insanity by rubbing shoulders with people more mad than themselves. In that way cases on the border-line were given the best possible chance of recovering their mental balance. The same principle was adopted in some of the ordinary lunatic asylums. It occurred to him that it was much better for the inmates to have this calm and peaceful domestic life than to be herded together in asylums. They had heard something about notification. In his opinion the local authority should empower the medical officer of health to visit the lunatic, and if he considered further investigation necessary he should certify the case in the usual way. Under the present system they had to get two medical men to visit the patient, and by cross-examination they tried to find out whether he was mad or not, and this was a very offensive method. When the doctor was examining he had to pretend that he had been called in to superintend the patient's general health. Consequently he had to try to deceive the patient, and very often the patient noticed this and deceived the doctor. After he had gone through this process of mental torture the justice of the peace came in and he might if he liked have the patient before him. After all this what condition did they expect the poor lunatic to be in by the time he arrived at the asylum? By that time the lunatic would become crystallised and hardened, and if he ever left the asylum at all he would be in a worse condition than when he went in.

The Commission consisted of three doctors and three barristers, and the doctors had three times as many people to look after now than they had when they were first appointed. Their work had been increased by more cases and more complex conditions. One doctor had now to inspect from 800 to 1,000 persons per day, and he wished to state emphatically that this condition of things was nothing more than a mere farce. The object of the Commissioner going round to the asylums was to see whether the inmates were mad or not, and whether they were being improperly detained. They had also to see that the necessary sanitary arrangements were provided. When a Commissioner had to examine between 800 and 1,000 persons in one day, he did not think the word "farce" was too strong a term to apply to such a condition of things. In Scotland they had double the number of Commissioners. He joined with his hon. friends in asking for a full inquiry, and he believed the Lord Chancellor sympathised with them in this matter and would have no objection to a Royal Commission.

Mr. BRIGG (Yorkshire, W.R., Keighley) said he intervened in the debate because the county council with which he was connected had forwarded a petition to the Government asking for the very same thing which had been demanded in the speeches of the two hon. Members who had preceded him. This county council had spent £1,276,908 in buildings and land, and therefore the Lunacy Commissioners ought to have some regard for the amount of money which the ratepayers were called upon to contribute for lunacy provision. This county council had now an asylum in course of erection which would cost £250,000 or £646 per head of the people to be accommodated. They had also been obliged to provide farm buildings and land in connection with the asylums, costing in one case over £6,000. They had erected two greenhouses costing £2,800, and he had noticed a considerable item for canaries and cages, and actually £3 3s. for a bassoon. He did not wish it to be understood that he had no feeling for the unfortunate people, for he had the deepest sympathy with those with whom they had to deal, but he wished to point out that this heavy expenditure was still going on, and they had to provide for about 140 additional patients every year. A very great increase in the cost of the buildings was due to the varying instructions and directions which were given by the Lunacy Commissioners. Many years ago the asylums only cost them £175 per head. The ratepayers had no control over this expenditure, except through their members on the county council, and everybody else connected with the asylums seemed to be interested in spending as much money as possible. The Commissioners were extravagant in their directions, and of course the medical officer wanted to have the finest establishment in the country. The staff were all provided with the very best of everything, and everybody but the ratepayers was considered.

He was anxious that there should be some inquiry in this matter. There were one or two points to which public attention ought to be directed. One of these was the different reasons assigned for the cause of lunacy. It was said that 18 per cent. of the cases were due to heredity and 23 per cent. to drink. The habitual drunkard's children in many instances found their way in the end into lunatic asylums. Another point to which he wished to direct attention was that a very large percentage of the patients sent to lunatic asylums were incurable. He thought a considerable difference might be made between the accommodation for curables and incurables. In one of the asylums 92 per cent. of the patients were said to be entirely incurable, and he thought it was unnecessary to supply splendid buildings, fittings, furniture, and appliances for the benefit of that class. They might be treated in another way, but not being a medical man, he could not advise what should be done. There ought to be a special division where weak-minded children might be treated. There was a large and increasing number of children being sent to lunatic asylums, some of them so young as five years of age. His suggestion was that the children should be dealt with by themselves, and that such work as they were able to perform should be got from them. It was a hazardous thing to say anything about the Commissioners. Hon. Members who were interested in the management of asylums would support him when he stated that it was a very difficult thing to please the Commissioners. In regard to the system of inspection, one objection which county councils had was that the same Commissioners did not always come round, the result being that changes were constantly ordered, one man reversing the instructions given by another. One man said that certain doors must always be left open, and another said that they must be made so that they would close. In connection with the asylum in his own district, when it was proposed to provide a fire escape for the patients one Commissioner said that the proper thing to have was a fire shoot through which the patients could be sent to the ground, and another Commissioner said they must have stairs. The Commissioners sometimes ordered a church to be provided, and he believed that they had no power to do so. They could order a chapel, and it was said that the appointment of a chaplain of the Church of England could be enforced. Free Church people had to find their own preachers on Sunday just as they best could. He desired that the Royal Commission which was to be appointed should inquire into the whole question, for nobody could doubt that the increase in lunacy was a very serious matter indeed. It might be owing to the conditions of our social life, but the public ought to know the reason. He hoped the inquiry which was to take place would satisfy the nation that the best was being done for the sufferers, and that the ratepayers' money was not being wasted.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis) said that a more important subject could scarcely engage the attention of the Committee. He could conceive scarcely any misfortune greater than lunacy. Death was scarcely more terrible. There was one misfortune greater than lunacy, and that was to be treated as a lunatic without being one. Men had been deprived of their liberty and kept as lunatics when, in fact, they were not, or, at any rate, were amenable to treatment without being confined.

Sir JOHN TUKE: Will the hon. Member quote a case of that kind?

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES said the hon. Member might remember that there was a novel which the writer stated was founded on facts. He could not cite a case within his own knowledge. At any rate the thing was possible. The hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of London had suggested that the purview of the man of science should be, as it were, extended beyond the actual certified lunatic to those who were in an incipient stage. With the very best object the hon. Member suggested that if science were allowed to deal with them at an earlier stage of lunacy they might with greater facility achieve a cure. That was no doubt true, but he thought it necessarily must involve the deprivation of the liberty of those subjected to that treatment. If a man in an incipient, or supposed incipient, stage of lunacy were handed over to men of science he must lose that personal liberty which they all prized beyond anything else. The incipient stage of lunacy was difficult to recognise. It was said that every man was more or less mad—

> "Great wits are sure to madness near allied,
> And thin partitions do their bounds divide."

It was conceivable that a committee of medical men under some such system as that suggested might certify that an individual was an incipient lunatic, and the consequences might be so serious that he boldly said it would be better to stand by the present system and run a certain amount of risk rather than to deprive a man of his liberty under such awful conditions. The hon. Member for West Aberdeenshire described how a supposed lunatic was interviewed by two doctors who endeavoured to trick him into an admission of lunacy while he, on the other hand, endeavoured to deceive them.

Dr. FARQUHARSON: I may have expressed myself very badly, but it was not my intention to say that.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES said he understood the hon. Member to say that there was a contest of wits between the supposed lunatic and the doctors. That was a very unfortunate thing to occur, and he believed it was a fact that some such contest did often happen. He had heard of an eminent man who kept an establishment in the West End of London where he did a vast amount of good in the treatment of lunatics. He asked a friend to dine with him and some of his lunatics, assuring him that if he did not touch on their particular delusions he would find them very interesting people. The guest at dinner sat next to a man who was most interesting. The patient asked him if he had come to place himself under the care of the doctor. "No," he replied, "I have only come to dine, and I am going away after dinner." "Ah," the patient said, "they always tell you that on the first day." The Commission should not be composed exclusively of men of science, and above all of doctors. He thought there should be a lawyer on it, and even a man of common sense, who was neither a doctor nor a lawyer.

Dr. HUTCHINSON (Sussex, Rye) said he did not agree with the hon. Member for King's Lynn that men or women were, in these days, shut up as lunatics who were not insane. It was at curious coincidence that for the past three days the House of Commons should have been discussing the drink question, and that now they were engaged on the question of lunacy. He thought the debate was very apropos. He only wished to say that on the proposed Lunacy Commission there should be an increase of the medical members and a decrease of the legal members. Another thing that ought to be recognised was that medical experts were demanding that there should be some way of securing early treatment of lunatics. They wanted to be able to separate different classes of lunatics, in the same way as they separated persons suffering from infectious diseases.

Lord EDMUND FITZMAURICE (Wiltshire, Crickdale) said he had been for a great number of years a member of the committee of one of the largest county lunatic asylums in the country; and he was sorry to say that that county (Wiltshire) held an unfortunately prominent position in the percentage of lunatics to total population. It was a well ascertained fact that in nearly every county where there was a high rate of lunacy there had been a very large emigration of the population. The strong and well-to-do left the county and left behind the poor and the weak. In the South and West of England they had suffered a great deal in that respect from the fact that manufactures and, consequently, employment had been transferred to other parts of the country. As bearing on the financial aspect of this question the poorer counties, like Wiltshire, had a very considerable claim on the attention of the Government in any inquiry which might be held as to the financial burdens which different counties had to bear for the maintenance of lunatics. Some counties were at present bearing a disproportionate part of the charge for what the law recognised was not a local but a national charge. What were the main reasons for putting aside local considerations as between county and county, and the main causes of the great increase in the charges to which his hon. friend had referred in his interesting speech? He was anxious to take a more comforting view of the situation than the alarmist view which had just been put before the Committee. He thought that, reading the Report of the Lunacy Commissioners, it would be rash to assume that the total increase in the number of lunatics in asylums necessarily pointed to a real increase in the number of lunatics in the country. And for this reason: When county asylums were first set up and the care of lunatics was taken out of private hands, there was a terrible fear among the poorer classes of seeing their relations put in these asylums. Recently there had been a great change in that feeling. Instead of the labourers fancying that their weak-minded relations who were taken off to the asylum would be badly treated, or even done to death, the feeling was now exactly the opposite. These asylums were now so admirably and expensively managed, that the standard of comfort in them was far above what these people were accustomed to in their own homes, and that entered into the calculations of these poor men and offered a temptation to them to send doubtful cases to the asylum rather than keep them at home. He did not suggest that the standard of living in the asylums should be lowered; on the contrary; but, nevertheless, it ought to be borne in mind that it did not follow that because there was an increase in the proportion of lunatics in asylums to population, say in the Highlands, that represented the same thing in the country at large. There had, been certain special reasons during the last few years why the proportion of lunatics to population had been sent up. It was universally recognised that six months after the close of the South African War there was a remarkable increase in lunacy. That was due to excitement as the war went on, which went to some people's heads, and to the fact that a great many persons had lost their relations by the chances of battle and disease, and were reduced to great poverty. There was no doubt that influenza—a disease to which they were all liable, especially in that House—had within the last few years sent a certain number of cases year by year to the asylums; but all of them were curable.

These being the facts, what were the steps which they were justified in asking the Government to adopt? He understood that the Government were practically pledged to grant some kind of inquiry or Commission, but he asked himself whether, in reality they had not had enough of inquiries and Royal Commissions? The main facts about the increase of lunacy were already known, and had been put in the most admirable language in the Reports of the Lunacy Commissioners. He remembered that some years ago the then Government promised that they would bring in a Bill in the next session on this subject, and that a *précis* of that Bill, extending to a column and a half, had appeared in the newspapers. He would like to ask what had become of that measure? Surely in these days the Government might spare a little time to look into the pigeon-holes of the Local Government Board and find that very useful and interesting suggested legislation. He remembered that there was a correspondence between the Government and the County Councils Association which had put forward certain points dealing with this question. He did not altogether approve of the plan to take certain cases from private asylums and put them into the workhouses under Government supervision, so that the boards of guardians should be entitled to receive the 4s. grant, which had had such a fatal effect in many cases. Ever since Sir Stafford Northcote in 1875 brought in this extra grant of 4s. there had been a tendency, working in concert with other causes, to take doubtful cases into the workhouse asylums in order to get the 4s. grant. He could not see any necessity for further inquiry on this question, because all the facts had been known for years. He thought the country owed a deep debt of gratitude to the Lunacy Commissioners. The hon. Member for Lynn Regis had unearthed ancient stories from old novels relating to a past state of things as to the capture and detention of sane men and women as lunatics; but the machinery of the Act of 1891 had provided very adequate protection for sane men and women, and he believed that such cases had been reduced to a minimum. There was now so much inspection by magistrates and other laymen, who were always ready to suspect the infallibility of the medical men, that if a person was locked up who ought not to be the chances were that he would be liberated inmediately. He could not understand the necessity for building expensive places of worship and providing all the requisites for the æsthetic accompaniments of an ornamental service which might appeal to all classes of the community who were in their sane mind. The Commissioners might be checked a little in this direction, while in all reasonable requirements they should be supported. He was sure that the Committee realised that the question of the increase of lunacy was one of the most painful and important that could be considered. He was rather inclined to doubt whether a further inquiry was necessary, though he would not resist it if it were proposed.

*SIR JOHN DORINGTON (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury) said that as one of the honorary Commissioners of Lunacy he wished to say a few words on the subject before the Committee. Reference had been made to the inadequacy of the Lunacy Commission in England as compared with Scotland. The Lunacy Commission in England was quite aware of that fact; and last year memorialised the Lord Chancellor on the subject and drew attention to the enormous growth of the work which was thrown upon them and which was really increasing beyond all reasonable dimensions. When the Commission was instituted there were 25,000 lunatics; now there were 140,000, and the number of asylums had increased from sixty-two in 1882 to eighty-seven now, and eleven more were under construction, some of which were just about to be opened. Every one of those asylums required to be visited and they increased the work of the Commissioners. He did not concur with what had been said with regard to the uselessness of the legal Commissioners. He thought that it was a very happy arrangement under which the medical members had the assistance of their legal *confrères*. As an honorary Commissioner he was able to state that legal questions often arose in which the assistance of the legal Commissioners was of the greatest value. He thought there should be an increase in the *personnel* of the Commission, and also that it should not be necessary that two Commissioners should visit every asylum. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Edinburgh University instanced a case in which a house had been kept for years for the reception of lunatics without supervision, but that was simply due to the fact that the police, or the inhabitants of the district, had not given information which would be at once attended to by the Commissioners. Whenever information was given the Commissioners applied to the Lord Chancellor for a visitation order, which was at once acted upon. With regard to the office work, the number of reception orders in 1882 was 15,960, and in 1902, 23,000. All these were, more or less, examined by the Commissioners, and from his own knowledge he would state that there was not a single lunatic in England the particulars of whose case was not known. The Commission worked extremely well, but it was overworked. It wanted an alleviation of its work, or an increase in the number of Commissioners. He thought that the legislation of 1892 in regard of the placing of Lunatics under control went as far as public opinion would allow. He knew the sad conditions which prevailed in a family when it was thought that a member of it was supposed to be verging on lunacy, and there was natural hesitation before taking any steps to have the patient certified. He very much doubted whether any change in the law would affect an improvement in such a case. He was strongly of opinion that they could not go very much further. He admitted what had been said regarding the importance of early treatment in lunacy cases, but the question was, how early should the public authorities intervene. He cordially supported his hon. friend in his demands for an inquiry regarding the adequacy, not the competency, of the Lunacy Commissioners for England. It was shorthanded, and an enormous amount of work had to be accomplished, and he hoped the Home Secretary would increase its *personnel.*

The ATTORNEY - GENERAL (Sir Robert Finlay, Inverness Burghs) said he was glad to know that the administration of lunacy was so satisfactory in Scotland, but, while allowing that anything said by the hon. Member for Edinburgh University on this subject carried great authority and deserved careful consideration, he could not agree with everything in his hon. friend's speech. He was not satisfied that there was proof of the actual increase in the amount of lunacy. Cases were now looked after as they were not under the barbarous state of the law in old days, and there was less reluctance to allow patients to enter well-managed modern asylums. If there was a real increase in the proportion of lunatics in the country apart from an apparent increase, it was not due to any defect in the law or its administration; it was due to the conditions of modern life. Under the much greater care taken of the young, many physically and mentally feeble persons survived who in old times would have disappeared in the early struggles for existence, and in such cases strain and stress such as had been alluded to might send the mind over the precipice. It was pleasing to observe that there was absolute confidence in the administration of the lunacy laws in Scotland, and that there were no scares and no scandals in that country. That might be due to the fact that Scotland was a smaller country than England and was easier to manage. But he thought his hon. friend drew too dark a picture when he suggested that in England there was an atmosphere of distrust in regard to the administration of the lunacy laws. He did not think his hon. friend had produced any evidence in support of that statement. He thought there was a very general and well-founded confidence in the way in which the lunacy laws were administered. The hon. Member for the Keighley Division had suggested that the cost of buildings for the care of lunatics was far too great. That might be so, but it was a matter largely under the control of the local authorities. Undoubtedly the local authorities had a potent voice in these matters, and if there was a resolute movement in the direction of economy, he was sure that, so far as it was consistent with efficiency, that movement would not be disregarded by the Commissioners.

*Mr. BRIGG said the local authorities did not like to express opinions contrary to those of the Commissioners.

Sir ROBERT FINLAY said the local authorities must acquire more moral courage in these matters. As to the number of the Commissioners, of course the Committee listened with interest to what was said by his hon. friend behind him with regard to the feeling of the Commissioners that some increase in their number was desirable. But he would suggest that before they embarked on an increase of the staff they should see whether the work of the existing staff could not be rearranged with advantage. He believed that a great deal could be done by relaxing the provision of the law as to the association of two Commissioners—a legal Commissioner and a medical Commissioner—on four of the six visits that were paid to each house in every year. Subject to proper provisions, such a relaxation might be made, and a Bill which had more than once passed through the House of Lords, but, owing to the opposition in the House of Commons, could not be passed into law, contained provisions for that purpose. Strong objection had been taken to legal Commissioners visiting the houses and lunatics in company with the medical Commissioners. But the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Tewkesbury, speaking from practical experience as a Commissioner, had expressed his opinion that a great deal of good had been done by the association of a legal Commissioner with a medical Commissioner, and they had reason to know that a similar view had been expressed by the medical Commissioners.

As to the question of incipient or threatened lunacy, he was not disposed to deny that in England we had very great jealousy for personal liberty. But he was not at all sure that that jealousy, in its origin noble and honourable, had not been pushed to an extent which might have interfered with the care which, if bestowed in time, might have prevented the patient from being stamped as a lunatic. It was said that that matter was better managed in Scotland. He would remind the House that the Bill which had passed more than once through the House of Lords and had been prevented from passing through the House of Commons contained clauses dealing with this very matter, relaxing the provisions of the law in a way which he believed would be found to give facilities for preventing the development of this terrible malady, and yet providing adequate securities against the machinery being abused for any purpose of oppression. That proposal had been made by the Government, and certainly it was very much to be desired that something of the kind should be carried out. It was not the view of the Government that a case had been made out for the appointment of a Royal Commission or a Committee to inquire into this subject. The question was pretty thoroughly understood. Attention had been called by high authorities to the points on which they considered there might be either legislation or improved administration. He was perfectly certain that everything that had been said in that debate would be properly considered, and no good could be done by setting up another inquiry into the whole subject of lunacy.

Sir EDWARD STRACHEY (Somersetshire, S.) said after the very unsatisfactory reply of the hon. and learned Attorney-General it was necessary on his part to move the reduction of this Vote by a sum of £100, in order that the dissatisfaction of the Committee might be expressed and emphasised. Those who practically had the administration of lunacy did not find it was anything like so satisfactory as the hon. and learned Gentleman appeared to think. He reminded the Attorney-General that in cases of building the plans had to go before the Lunacy Commissioners, who, if not satisfied, could make any alterations they chose. An unsatisfactory feature connected with the proceedings was that the architects to the Lunacy Commissioners were allowed to take private work. He knew a case in which the committee of the county lunatic asylum were advised to choose a particular architect on the ground that he was employed by the Lunacy Commissioners, and that they would consequently have no difficulty in getting their plans through. That was a state of things which ought not to be. As architects were paid a percentage on the cost of the building, it was only natural that they should desire to see expensive buildings erected, and it was wholly against the public interest that the check upon them through the Lunacy Commissioners should be rendered ineffective in the manner he had described. He begged to move the reduction of the Vote by £100.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £10,159, be granted for the said Service." — (*Sir Edward Strachey.*)

Dr. FARQUHARSON hoped, in view of the unsatisfactory and perfunctory reply of the Attorney-General, that his hon. friend would press his Motion to a division. It would, however, have some effect on his own vote if the hon. and learned Gentleman gave an assurance that the Bill which passed the House of Lords four years ago should be re-introduced early next session and Government facilities granted to secure its passage through the House.

Sir ROBERT FINLAY assured the hon. Member that he was alive to the importance of the Bill referred to, but it was impossible for him to give any pledge of the nature asked for. The matter would not be lost sight of. He could say no more than that.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 126; Noes, 216. (Division List No. 122.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Allen, Charles P.
Ambrose, Robert
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Austin, Sir John
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B
Boland, John
Brigg, John
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Burke, E. Haviland
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Causton, Richard Knight
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Crombie, John William
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Edwards, Frank
Elibank, Master of
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herb.John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gordon, Hn. J.E(Elgin & Nairn
Hammond, John
Hayden, John Patrick
Hayter, Rt. Hn. Sir Arthur D.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Hobhouse, C.E.H. (Bristol, E.
Hope, John Denas (Fife, West)
Horniman, Frederick John
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Hutchinson, Dr. Charles Fredk.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, David Brynmor (Sw'ns'
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kilbride, Denis
Labouchere, Henry
Law, Hugh Alex.(Donegal, W.
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leamy, Edmund
Leese, Sir Jos. F. (Accrington)
Leng, Sir John
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lundon, W.
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Malcolm, Ian
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mooney, John J.
Morgan, J.Lloyd (Carmarthen
Moulton, John Fletcher
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Shaughnessy, P. J
Palmer, Sir Chas. M. (Durham
Parrott, William
Partington, Oswald
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John
Robson, William Snowdon
Roche, John
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Slack, John Bamford
Soares, Ernest J.
Spencer, Rt.Hn.C.R(Northants
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomas, Sir A.(Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Tomkinson, James
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Walton Joseph (Barnsley)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Weir, James Galloway
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whiteley, George (York, W. R.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wood, James
Woodhouse, Sir J T(Huddersf'd
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Edward Strachey and Sir John Tuke.

NOES.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Allhusen, Augustus H. Eden
Allsopp, Hon. George
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt Hn. Hugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon, John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A.J(Manch'r
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Balfour, Rt. Hn Gerald W(Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Beach, Rt. Hon. Sir M. Hicks
Bignold, Arthur
Bill, Charles
Bond, Edward
Boulnois, Edmund
Bowles, Lt.-Col H. F(Middlesex
Bowles, T.Gibson (King'sLynn
Brassey, Albert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cavendish, V.C.W(Derbyshire
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Chamberlain, Rt.Hn.J.A(Worc.
Chapman, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Coates, Edward Feetham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Colomb, Rt. Hon. Sir John C.R.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Craig, Charles Curtis(Antrim, S.
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Dalkeith, Earl of

Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Denny, Colonel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Dimsdale, RtHn.Sir Joseph C.
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon
Dorington, Rt. Hon. SirJohnE.
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Dyke, Rt. Hn Sir William Hart
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fergusson, RtHn. Sir J.(Manc'r
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Fitzgerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzroy,Hon.Edward Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flower, Sir Ernest
Forster, Henry William
Foster,Philip S(Warwick,S.W.
Fyler, John Arthur
Gardner, Ernest
Garfit, William
Gordon,Maj Evans(T'rH'mlets
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.
Goschen, Hon. GeorgeJoachim.
Groves, James Grimble
Gunter, Sir Robert
Hamilton,Marq of(L'nd'nderry
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heaton, John Henniker
Hermon-Hodge,Sir Robert T.
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hogg, Lindsay
Hope, J.F(Sheffield,Brightside
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversham)
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hozier, Hn, James HenryCecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Jessel, Captain HerbertMerton
Kennaway, Rt.Hn.Sir John H.
Kerr, John
Kimber, Henry
Knowles, Sir Lees
Lambton, Hn. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawrence, Sir Joseph(Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, J. Grant (Yorks. N.R
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Leveson-Gower, FrederickN.S.
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long, RtHnWalter(Bristol,S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Lucas, ReginaldJ(Portsmouth
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Calmont, Colonel James
M'Iver, Sir L. (Edinburgh W.
Majendie, James A. H.
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Maxwell,RtHnSirHE(Wigt'n.
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milner, Rt. Hon.SirFrederickG
Milvain, Thomas
Mitchell, Edw.(Fermanagh,N.
Mitchell, William (Burnley)
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Moore, William
Morrell, George Herbert
Morrison, James Archibald
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray, RtHnA.Graham(Bute
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Murray, Col, Wyndham (Bath)
Myers, William Henry
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Peel, Hn.Wm.Robert Wellesley
Pemberton, John S. G.
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretyman, Ernest George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Rasch, Sir Frederick Carne
Reid, James (Greenock)
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Renwick, George
Ridley, S.Forde(Bethnal Green
Ritchie, Rt.Hn. Chas.Thomson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Samuel, SirHarryS(Limehouse
Saunderson, Rt.Hn.Col.Edw.J.
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely,Maj.J.E.B.(Isle of Wight
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Smith,Abel H. (Hertford,East)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Spear, John Ward
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.
Stewart,Sir MarkJ.M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Stroyan, John
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomlinson, Sir Wm. Edw. M.
Tuff, Charles
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Walrond,RtHn.SirWilliam H.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Webb, Colonel William George
Welby, Lt.-ColA.C.E.(Taunton
Welby, Sir Charles G.E.(Notts.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Wilson, A.Stanley(York, E.R.
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wilson, J.W.(Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson-Todd, Sir W.H.(Yorks.
Wodehouse, Rt.Hn. E.R.(Bath
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Worsley-Taylor, Henry Wilson
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B.Stuart-
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.

Original Question put, and agreed to.

REVENUE DEPARTMENTS.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £6,400,618, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Post Office Services, the Expenses of Post Office Savings Banks, and Government Annuities and Insurances, and the Collection of the Post Office Revenue."

*THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): I think it would be convenient to the House that I should make a statement, first, as to what has been done in the past, and what is proposed to be done in the future, in regard to the administration of the Post Office. The first point that occurs to me is as to the various proposals put forward by my predecessor, and how far they have been put into execution. The first one which hon. Members will desire to hear about is on the subject of the Committee which my right hon. friend the present Chancellor of the Exchequer appointed last year to inquire into the wages of certain Post Office officials. My right hon. friend appointed a Committee composed of various business men, under the presidency of Sir Edward Bradford. I found this Committee appointed when I came into office, but they had not at that moment actually begun their sittings. I asked them to continue the work which my right hon. friend placed in their hands, and I gave instructions, which I think have been fully and loyally carried out, that those men who wished to give evidence should be given every possible facility to do so, and that no hindrance whatever should be put in the way of those who wished to lay their case before what I hold to be a good and independent tribunal. The Committee has only reported to me within the last few days; I think it was on Tuesday last that I received their Report. At any rate, I did not see their Report until that day myself. As a general rule, I do not think it is held that Departmental Committee Reports are necessarily published to the House or the public, but I feel that the Report of a Committee like the one I have mentioned, takes the form of rather more than a Departmental Committee Report, and it is obviously necessary that the whole of it should be in the hands of hon. Members. In addition to that, I think the House should have ample time for the consideration and discussion of that Report. I have not received the whole of the evidence and the appendices, and therefore I am not in a position to lay the Report on the Table of the House. I think, therefore, the best way for the convenience of the House would be that I should postpone Vote III., which is the Telegraphs and Telephones, on the present occasion, and defer it until a later day in the session when hon. Members will have this Report in their hands, and although I may not at the time be able to give a decision as to the policy of the Government on that Report, hon. Members will then, I think, be perfectly free to discuss it and draw their own conclusions from the Report. Upon this point I wish to ask you, Mr. Deputy Chairman, whether I should be in order in putting the question in this way before the House, and would the House be in order in discussing not only the Report, but also the case of the civil servants and Post Office servants, who had not been included, but who hon. Members think ought to have been included in the inquiry. Really I think there ought to be a sort of half discussion on one Vote and half-discussion on the other Vote. I have consulted Mr. Deputy-Speaker, and he has informed me that he will, under the circumstances, allow a full discussion of those officials included in the Report and of those not included in the Report on Vote 3, which is the Vote for the Telegraphs and the Telephones.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think it would be more convenient to take the discussion as suggested by the noble Lord on the Vote for Telegraphs and Telephones. You cannot discuss the Report on both these Votes, and I think the Committee will prefer to take the discussion on the Telephones and Telegraphs Vote.

Mr. BAYLEY (Derbyshire, Chesterfield) asked if sufficient time would be allowed for hon. Members to fully consider the Report?

*Lord STANLEY said the best promise he could give was that his Estimates would not come on until the Report of the Departmental Committee had been in the hands of hon. Members sufficient time to allow themselves to become thoroughly conversant with its contents. He hoped they would not discuss this question at the present moment, but leave it over until a future date.

*Sir ALBERT ROLLIT (Islington, S.) said he thought the proposal of the noble Lord was not unreasonable, but it should not be forgotten that this Committee was appointed a year ago, and therefore he hoped there would be as little further delay as possible. He was glad that the noble Lord had undertaken to publish the Report, and he hoped that at an early period they would have an opportunity of discussing it. He wished to know if such questions as not only wages and duties, but stagnation of promotion, sanitation of the offices, the £190 maximum, and matters of that kind, would be included in the Report. He thought the noble Lord should have time to consider the Report, and he relied upon his doing so kindly and sympathetically. He agreed that it would be best to deal with the whole matter upon the adjourned Vote, when the long-standing grievances of both postal and telegraph employees could be fully discussed.

Mr. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green) said that many hon. Members had come down with the idea that this Vote was going to be taken, but if it was adjourned until the Report was placed on the Table, he wished to know whether they would be precluded from dealing with those officials who were not included in the Report. There were only four classes included connected with the postal service, and he wished to know whether they would be ruled out of order when the Report came up, and not be allowed to discuss the question as to the advisability or right of those outside the four classes to be considered.

The DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN: I understand that the wages are paid partly under the Post Office Vote and partly under the Telegraphs and Telephones Vote; therefore it would be in order to discuss the question of wages under either Vote. I think, however, that it is the opinion of the Committee that the discussion on these points should be restricted to the Telegraphs and Telephones Vote when the Report has been laid on the Table.

*Lord STANLEY said he was perfectly certain it would be for the convenience of the Committee that they should not discuss a Report which was not before it. He was perfectly certain, also, that when the Report was before the Committee, it would be better not to discuss it piecemeal. He had the permission of Mr. Deputy-Speaker, confirmed by Mr. Deputy-Chairman, for stating that on the later Vote they would be able to discuss these matters when the Report of the Committee was in their hands, so that if they made a sacrifice now by abstaining from discussion on this particular Vote, they would be able to speak on another occasion. He hoped, therefore, that hon. Members would accept the assurance that, at any rate so far as he was concerned, there would be full opportunity for discussing the Report as soon as possible.

Mr. BAYLEY said that on behalf of the Post Office employees, whom he represented, he was satisfied with the assurance given by the Postmaster-General.

Mr. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD (Liverpool, West Derby) said he should like to ask the Postmaster-General one question. The House understood last year that the Committee was to deal only with the question of wages. There were a number of other very important topics which required to be considered, and he wanted to know from the Postmaster-General whether these topics were dealt with in the Report. For instance, he wanted to know whether it dealt with the important question of the prospects of promotion, and also with the hours and conditions of employment. If they were to understand that the Report dealt with matters of that kind, he thought it would be more satisfactory to discuss it on a future occasion, when it was before them.

*Lord STANLEY said he had already stated that none of the rights of hon. Members would be sacrificed by postponing the discussion. The hon. Member would be allowed to discuss not only the matters dealt with in the Report, but also those which he thought ought to be included. He thought it would be found that everything had been taken into consideration, for rates of wages were not the only things that affected a man's livelihood. There was the question of the cost of living, as also various other things which had been taken into consideration. Some views had been put before him by hon. Members privately, and he thought he could safely say that all had been put before the Committee and dealt with by them. His hon. friend the Member for South Islington had asked him whether the Report said anything about sanitation, and whether anything had been done in regard to that matter. He confessed that he had from lack of time not been able to go carefully into the subject up to the present, nor had he been able to read the whole of the evidence given with respect to it. He knew that the Committee had considered the question of the health of the Post Office servants, but he did not know what the Report said. He hoped to be able to do something to improve those offices which, he regretted to say, had been found to be, as regarded sanitation, not in a suitable condition.

He had little or nothing really to state to the House as to alterations in the postal service of the country during the past year. There had been various small reforms, and even small reforms cost a great deal of money. An attempt had been made to extend the usefulness of the halfpenny post by allowing a little more of those printed statements which were in common commercial usage. It might interest the House to know that they were endeavouring to extend the motor services of the Post Office. Personally he was an enthusiast on motoring, and he should like to see these services extended very largely. but he was bound to say that at the present moment motors were not sufficiently reliable to depend upon in any great degree. He did not want to advertise the firms that had done badly, but, perhaps he was doing no firm injury if he said that the car running between London and Epping, which was supplied by the Milnes-Daimler Company, was providing a most excellent service. There was no doubt that both as to speed and economy it was standing them in good stead, and he hoped that the services might be extended in other directions, and that in time they might find motor-cars a means of quickening the delivery of letters and parcels in the rural districts.

In the issue of postal orders several changes had been made. He had proposed to all the Colonies that there should be an interchange of postal orders between them and this country; so that orders issued in this country should be payable in the Colonies and *vice versa*. A large number of the Colonies had already agreed to the arrangement, and in a few months he hoped that all of them would follow. The new denominations of postal orders introduced last year had apparently met a real public want. Of the guinea orders 500,000 were paid in the year ended 31st March last, and of the orders for 5s. 6d. and 6s. 6d. nearly 750,000 were paid. He had not found that up to the present the postal order for 6d. had been much asked for; but he was in hopes that it would come to be used for the payment of those advertisements which at present were paid for in stamps. In the year ended March last, postal orders were paid to the amount of £34,250,000, as compared with £33,000,000 in the preceding year. But the number paid was 90,720,000, as compared with 93,140,000 in the preceding year; so that the public, it appeared, were in very many cases now able to remit by means of one order where previously two had been necessary. Another reform to meet the public convenience was the issue of twenty-four stamps in a little book. The charge of one halfpenny over the value of the stamps had been objected to as making an inconvenient sum. The Post Office might obviate the difficulty by substituting twelve halfpenny stamps for six of the penny stamps in the book, so that the purchaser would only have to tear out one of the halfpenny stamps instead of having to produce a halfpenny to make up the price of the book. The Post Office was also considering the advisability of issuing books of stamps of higher denominations. As to money orders, inconvenience had been felt from the comparatively low limit—£10—fixed for inland money orders. From the beginning of the present year the limit had been extended to £40, and a similar increase had been arranged for with a large number of foreign countries.

One increase appeared in the Estimates which he hoped would meet with the universal approbation of the House. It had been found that there were many cases of unestablished men and sub-postmasters who did not come under the benefits of the Superannuation Act; and who, at the end of long and faithful service, had nothing to look for. With the consent of the Treasury a sum of £5,000 had been put in the Estimates to enable some sort of gratuity to be given in hard cases of this kind. For many reasons he was glad that the telephone discussion had been postponed. Later in the session he hoped to be able to give more definite information to the House as to the progress of the negotiations with the telephone company, and as to the future organisation and administration of wireless telegraphy. He hoped that he should be able to assure the House that the Post Office were arriving at a conclusion which would prevent the growing up in this country of a monopoly such as there had been experience of in the past. At the same time, he should be able to show that he was not dealing unfairly with those who had made wireless telegraphy a possibility. He had no great departmental reforms in prospect, but if there were money to spare, he should like to extend increased postal facilities to those districts that were now poorly served.

There was one important reform which he was prepared to make, and it was one which he knew would interest his hon. friend the Member for Canterbury. The hon. Member had always been very anxious that the penny postage to the Colonies should be extended to Australia. He was glad to say that with the consent of the Treasury—having had some indication that Australia was willing to come into the arrangement—he had asked the Colonial Office to inform the authorities there that if they would give an assurance that at a definite date in the near future they would agree to institute a penny postage rate between Australia and England, he was ready to introduce it at once between England and Australia. He was, therefore, in hopes that the Australian postal authorities would soon see their way to agree to this proposition. He was afraid that the statement he had put before the Committee was somewhat dull, but he hoped the House would accept it as a full and simple statement of what he had been able to do and not to do. At the same time, he would be ready to answer any Questions put to him on points of detail, and he hoped that, in the end, the Committee would justify all the steps he had taken on the matters brought before him.

Mr. HEMPHILL (Tyrone, N.) said he wished to know whether the noble Lord had come to any decision in regard to what was called cash on delivery? The reason of that query was that he had had several letters from his constituents stating that the present system of cash on delivery interfered with the business of small traders.

Mr. LOUIS SINCLAIR (Essex, Romford) said he was sure that the Committee must be very grateful to the Postmaster-General for his interesting statement; but there was one matter which he would like to bring under his notice. English newspapers had now, owing to the hostilities between Russia and Japan, to travel by sea, instead of overland. But Germany had made arrangements with the Siberian Railway to get their newspapers delivered in China a fortnight before the English papers. He begged the noble Lord to see whether he could not arrive at some arrangement with the Siberian Railway by which they could carry English newspapers. He congratulated the noble Lord on the arrangements he had made for the use of motor-cars in postal delivery. He remembered the time when such a suggestion was received with ridicule; and he was sure that in many districts the delivery of letters and newspapers would be greatly facilitated by the use of motor-cars. He understood that the Telegraph Vote was to be discussed on a future occasion, but he should like to point out now that a telegram of two words from France to Great Britain cost, at the minimum rate, 4d., whereas a telegram from Great Britain to France cost, at the minimum rate, 10d. That ought to be remedied. Then the time had, he considered, arrived when the postage from here to France should be reduced to 1d. or 1½d. He was sure that if the noble Lord approached the French Postmaster-General on this question he would be met half-way.

*Mr. McCRAE (Edinburgh, E.) said he hoped the promised discussion on the Report would not be delayed to a late period of the session. As to telephones, did he understand the noble Lord to say that an opportunity would be afforded for discussing the policy of the Government on that subject on the same Vote as on the telegraphs?

*LORD STANLEY said that they would come on separately.

*MR. McCRAE said that they ought to know at the earliest possible date what the Government proposed to do in regard to the acquisition of the whole telephone system of the country.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON (Canterbury) said he congratulated the Postmaster-General on the reforms he had introduced during the last year; but he wished to point out that the assurances which the noble Lord had given the Committee in regard to the postage to Australia were very unsatisfactory. Two years ago the late Postmaster-General promised exactly the same thing. They were told that Canada had suffered very considerably from the large numbers of letters which had been sent from there to Australia and which had been overcharged in postage. Immediately on receiving that information he communicated with Lord Strathcona, who telegraphed to the Postmaster-General of the Dominion as to how the system had worked between Canada and Australia; and Lord Strathcona received from the Postmaster-General of Canada the following cable—

> "Representations to Lord Stanley about penny postage between Canada and Australia not working unsatisfactorily absolutely unfounded. First two or three months noticed increase in short-paid letters, then this entirely ceased and is now working without a flaw."

He had a letter from Mr. Barton, the late Premier of the Australian Commonwealth, practically saying the same thing, and he thought that the penny postage to Australia should be established at once. He wished to ask his right hon. friend the Postmaster-General as to what he was doing to establish a universal penny post. He would urge that efforts should be made to establish cheap postage between Great Britain and other European countries. At present it cost 2½d. to send a letter from Dover to Calais, whilst the rate to India and China was only 1d. The postage between England and France should be the inland rate of the country of origin, as was the case between the United States and Canada. He did not think they were making full use of their opportunities for developing friendly relations with France by continuing to charge several times as much for postage to France as for postage to Jersey. As regarded money orders, he complained that the rate from England to France was much higher than the rate from France to England. The amount for which in England 6d. would have to be paid would be covered in France by a charge of 1d. That was a ridiculous state of affairs. In Germany the Post Office delivered money of which it was the medium of transmission at the payee's address without making any addition to the original charge. He thought some similar arrangement might be made with advantage in this country, and it was a reform which would commend itself to the whole country. He wished to draw attention also to the vexatious manner in which the present restrictions on the conveyance of samples operated, and he would urge that greater facilities should be allowed.

Whilst the Post Office was, on the whole, the best and greatest in the world, it was, he was afraid, guilty of meanness in some details. At present it was the custom to exact fines from holders of postal orders not presented within the proper period. A case had come to his notice in which a man had had to pay 7s. 2d. in order to obtain the value of a 7s. order. That was ridiculous. No Jew ever behaved so badly as that. The Post Office had the use of the money for a considerable time, and made a charge for it. Fines on postal orders amounted to an enormous sum. He trusted the matter would receive attention. In the case of prepaid reply telegraph forms not used within two months the Post Office refused to refund the money. That, too, was, he thought, hardly worthy of the Post Office. The fee for the registration of letters might be reduced with advantage from 2d. to 1d. In the case of letters insufficiently stamped, double the deficiency was charged. That was grossly unfair. Again, the Post Office not only destroyed an embossed stamp which was pasted on a letter, but surcharged as if the letter had not been stamped at all. The heavy fines for insufficient postage should be abolished.

Complaint was made by many hon. Members of the great delay in the morning delivery of letters. His view was that this delay would be greatly mitigated if there were three classes of postmen—the first class to deliver letters, the second newspapers, and the third parcels. Another reform he would commend to his noble friend was the placing of letter-boxes in all through trains. In every part of the Continent letter-boxes were to be found on the trains, while in this country letters could be posted on only very few trains. Another small matter that could easily be remedied was this—that the British stamp was the only stamp in the world which did not bear upon its face the country of origin. It was also desirable that there should be an international stamp, or, at any rate, that one should be able to purchase the stamps of other countries at the General Post Office. In Ceylon, in India, and in parts of Australia notices would be found bearing the words "British stamps sold here;" but there was no place in connection with the British Post Office where foreign stamps could be purchased. Another reform which had been advocated in the House was the right of senders to recall letters posted by mistake. In other countries, if anyone posted a letter by mistake he went to the postmaster, wrote out the exact address on the letter, and stated its contents, and the postmaster at once stopped the letter, and if satisfied as to the writer would hand it back. From the British Post Office letters once posted could never be recovered. Then there was the question of lotteries. The British Post Office authorities contended that they had no authority to open letters. Vast masses of letters were posted in this country for German lotteries, which it would be perfectly easy for the authorities to identify. In Canada and the United States the law secured absolute immunity to postmasters and they seized thousands of letters.

Then there was the question of getting compensation for Post Office blunders. Post Office officials on the whole were very honourable and respectable men, but in spite of that there were a number of convictions for stealing letters, and if a Post Office official was found with stolen orders they were not given up. The Postmaster-General was surrounded by rules and regulations which absolved him from all responsibility. He thought a little pressure might be used to secure the reform of the law in this direction. In telegrams the most astounding and wicked blunders were made, for which there was no redress. Another matter was the desirability of securing a penny postage to Egypt. Letters could be sent for a penny to Singapore and many of the China stations, but immediately a traveller reached Egypt his letters cost 2½d. He could not understand why his noble friend did not immediately remedy this grievance. Then there was the enormously high charge for the postage of magazines. Very often more was charged than the cost of the magazine, while newspapers 2lb. in weight were carried for ½d. In New Zealand magazines to the weight of 8oz. went through the post for a penny, and it would be a great boon to the people of this country if they could get their magazines through the post at a more reasonable rate.

Sir JOHN LENG (Dundee) thought the announcement by the Postmaster-General concerning the offer he had made to Australia ought, on the whole, to be received with gratitude, and he hoped that in a corresponding spirit the noble Lord would make overtures to the Government of Canada to facilitate the introduction of British newspapers and literature into the Dominion on terms enabling them to compete with the newspapers of the United States. He feared the hon. Member who had just spoken would have to remain in the House for at least fifty years to see many of the suggestions he had made carried into effect. There was one short way of securing his ends, and that was that when the present Postmaster-General in due course was elevated to a more responsible position the hon. Member for Canterbury should be his successor. With regard to the halfpenny postage, some consideration ought to be given by the Post Office to the fact that, while heavy sixpenny newspapers weighing several pounds went for a halfpenny, the same rate was charged for the much smaller papers chiefly read by the working classes. This rule really acted as a discrimination in favour of the wealthy, who were accustomed to purchase these heavy illustrated publications. Many of the reforms initiated by the present Chancellor of the Exchequer were recognised as being of great advantage; and, although the noble Lord had modestly disclaimed having brought forward any great reform himself, it was recognised in the Department that his bright and breezy personality had introduced a greater stimulus to activity and reform than had hitherto been apparent.

He had had a communication placed in his hands from a comparatively poor man of excellent character in the Highlands of Scotland, whose daughter in 1901 passed with credit her examination for entrance into the service as a Post Office clerk. Since that date she had been discharging her duties in a fashionable South Coast town, but was still in the "learners' class," with a salary of 5s a week. This young woman's father and mother, after the honourable manner of Scotch parents, had denied themselves in order to give their daughter a good education, and since the examination in 1901 they had continued the course of self-denial for the purpose of supplementing her salary of 5s. a week. It was not right that well-educated young women should remain for a couple of years on such a salary. The amount was not sufficient to make both ends meet, and it exposed the girls to great temptations. He hoped the noble Lord would look into this question, as the instance he had given was by no means an isolated case. He further desired to bring under the notice of the Postmaster-General a matter affecting the post office in his own constituency. Last autumn, acting strictly according to the regulations of the Department, the deliverers in the post office at Dundee made a respectful representation, which passed through the hands of the postmaster, and was known to have been forwarded to Edinburgh. In that presentation they stated that their department was understaffed and overworked, and that the records of the office would show that a number of young men had broken down in health owing to the conditions under which they worked, the early deliverers not being allowed sufficient time for meals before they were sent out again. What he wished to remark upon was the dilatory movement of the Department in dealing with complaints of that sort. Some weeks ago, in reply to a Question, the Postmaster-General stated that the representation had been received, and yet, although it was dated September last, he had just had a telegram saying that nothing had been done to remedy the matters complained of. The noble Lord, who was a capable man, ought to stir up the officials of the Department, and see that when proper representations were made they were not put into a pigeon-hole or filed without having been investigated, and that if on investigation the complaints were proved to be well-founded they were promptly dealt with. It would be far better to say "no" to an application and say it promptly, than to hang up the matter indefinitely and keep the men in a state of suspense. He hoped the noble Lord, who, he believed, was the right man in the right place, would act vigorously in his Department, and see that these matters were promptly dealt with.

MR. H. C. RICHARDS (Finsbury, E.) expressed a fear lest the noble Lord, although the right man in the right place, should be "squelched" by the permanent officials in the Department. He desired to draw attention to a grievance suffered by business people, viz., the tampering with their correspondence in the halfpenny post. This practice was indulged in by over zealous officials simply that it might be known that they had obtained certain excess payments for the Post Office. Recently in a country post office he was told that they had opened the halfpenny letters, and as a result had exacted by excessive distraint the sum of 4s. 2d. from the unfortunate people who received their invoices from London through the halfpenny post. The letters of a firm in his own constituency were sometimes delayed until as late as twelve o'clock, when the weekly or monthly raid was on, in order that their halfpenny letters might be gone through individually. The Postmaster-General had said that certain changes had been made; but the complaint was that when the noble Lord started on the path of common sense he stopped half way on the journey. If common sense prevailed at the Post Office they would not hear of the words "per Pickford" on invoices going for a half penny while the words "forward per Pickford" entailed a penny fine. This system of espionage was absolutely indefensible, and he appealed to the right hon. Gentleman to break down these absurd distinctions which harassed commerce, delayed letters, and made officials of the Post Office Shylocks and taxgatherers of the worst description instead of servants of the public. The practice of inflicting a penny fine for adding the word "forward" to "per Pickford" and similar distinctions was unworthy of a great commercial nation, and the noble Lord would go down to posterity as one who had done as much for business people as Mr. Fawcett himself if he would only put a stop to this system and insisted on common sense being used. With regard to colonial and foreign postage, he believed that the Postmaster-General at Washington was personally only too willing to establish a penny rate between England and America. What the Canadians complained of, and what was very inimical to Imperial interests and instincts, was that newspapers from the United States could pass into Canada at a much lower rate than newspapers from this country. The consequence was that the Canadian world was saturated with the American view of matters rather than with the view of the mother country, and the territories in the great North-West were allowed to get their magazines and newspapers from across the border instead of from England, because the Canadian Post Office could not get from this country the same advantages as were offered by the United States. Penny postage with France was not half so important as an arrangement with Australia, and he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would make every effort to conclude the great system which the Duke of Norfolk gave to the country as a Jubilee present.

He further urged that the regulation with regard to communications on the face of post-cards for transmission inland should be extended to the whole of the Empire. As to letter-boxes on through trains they were really a necessity. It was utterly absurd that a passenger should be unable to post a letter upon the train which he knew was bringing up the London mail. If they could post in the letter-box at the railway stations up to the time of the departure of the train it would not be so bad, but these letter-boxes were cleared and the letters taken away to the post office and then brought back. There was no reason why they could not be sorted in the train, nor was there any reason why letter-boxes should not be put into the through mail trains, so the passengers on the train might write and post their correspondence while travelling. He asked the noble Lord also to consider the feasibility of a penny post to Egypt. It was absurd that this one place should be the only place to which we could not send a letter for a penny. It was not the Egyptian Post Office which made any difficulty, but those Post Office officials in this country, who never rejoiced so much as when, instead of considering the public and removing these petty obnoxious and trying measures generally, kept the public at arms length. One point to which he wished to draw attention was the number of hours at which post office officials in rural and local offices were kept at work during the Christmas time. He could give the Postmaster-General the name of a postmaster who in that time of pressure refused to get outside assistance and worked the young men, under twenty-one years of age, twenty-two hours out of the twenty-four for a week before the Christmas morning, with the result that on Christmas morning these poor young men fell asleep on the sacks and were physically incapable of sorting the letters. And this course was pursued solely in order that the postmaster might show that he was able to cope with this enormous delivery without employing extra assistance. In his opinion, in times of pressure, such as Christmas time, twelve hours a day should be the limit of time to which these men should work.

In regard to the Post Office contracts, which would come in on another Vote, he hoped the Postmaster-General, before the contract with the P. and O. Company expired, would give an opportunity to those who desired to make some strong remarks on the subject to express their views on the way in which the P. and O. service between this country and India was carried on; also with regard to the way passengers on those boats were treated, and generally with regard to the conduct of the company. He appealed to the Postmaster-General to encourage and not discourage the carriage of letters for a halfpenny. He drew attention to the fact that letters weighing two ounces could be, and were, carried by Parliamentary sanction for a halfpenny, and said it was unfair that the public should be mulcted and fined simply because some absurd and antiquated regulations were not carried out. In India a postcard could be sent throughout the length and breadth of the land for a farthing, and a letter weighing half an ounce for a halfpenny. In conclusion, he urged the Postmaster-General to remember that the Postal Service existed for the benefit of the country, and not the country for the benefit of the Postal Service.

*MR. NANNETTI said before making his own complaint he desired strongly to support that made by the hon. Gentleman opposite as to the delay in the delivery of letters in this country. There was no reason why letters posted in time to catch the night mail from Dublin should not be delivered in London by the morning delivery instead of as at present at mid-day. He had had many complaints as to this.

*LORD STANLEY: If the hon. Gentleman would get for me the envelopes of letters so delivered it would greatly help me in making an inquiry.

*MR. NANNETTI was understood to assent. Continuing, the hon. Member said he had ventured last year when the Departmental Committee to inquire into the wages of the Post Office officials was appointed to intimate that it would not meet with the approval of and give satisfaction to the men employed in the Postal Service. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Worcestershire, the predecessor of the noble Lord, however, was callous to all appeals made by hon. Members on behalf of the postal servants, and appointed that Committee to deal with a particular subject. The feeling in the Postal Service at the present moment was more than ever a feeling of deep discontent and dissatisfaction at the manner in which they were being treated. He had in his hand an extract from a letter of one of the most popular postal organisations in London, which dealt with the grievance that existed in this country. While giving evidence before the Committee it was made obvious by the postal servants that they could not look on this Committee as impartial because there was no representative of the working classes, who would be likely to sympathise with or have any knowledge of the views and grievances of the postal servants, upon it. He desired to-day to make an appeal to the noble Lord, and to say that no rest or security would be given to the postal authorities until a Committee of this House was appointed to deal with the whole of the grievances under which the postal servants were now suffering. The extract said—

> "We wish to make it perfectly clear that we do not regard the Committee as in any way an impartial or satisfactory body. We have been informed by Mr. Hanbury that Parliament was our Court of Appeal and we think as State servants our grievances should be decided by a tribunal formed of the peoples' representatives."

He agreed with the organisation that sent out that notice, and the nobleLord need not flatter himself that the findings of the Committee would do away with the grievances that now existed. That was the opinion expressed in London. He would now give the opinion expressed in Dublin where the servants of the Post Office had also an organisation. It would be remembered that last year they said distinctly that the constitution of the Committee had caused much dissatisfaction in the service. They had declared that the findings of the Committee which was appointed could not be accepted as final, and that a Parliamentary Committee was still demanded by the postal servants. It would naturally be expected that he should give some reasons why this demand had been made. He would not attempt to trespass on the prerogatives of English and Scotch Members. He would leave them to bring forward the grievances of the postal servants in England and Scotland. He would deal with the grievances that affected his own country and specially his own constituency. He had been inundated with letters in regard to these grievances, and he had pestered the noble Lord in regard to them more than he wished to do.

The first point he wished to draw attention to was that of those called "learners." The question of learners in Ireland was a serious one. What was the system over there. Young lads were taken into the service in an inordinately large number—more than could possibly be required. They were brought in at 6s. a week, and they were kept working at that wage even when they had mastered the business. They were employed in handling most valuable documents—money orders, etc. What was the result? In several cases petty thefts had been committed by boys earning 6s. a week. He said that was not right. It was not a wage that the Government should offer to these boys. The Government would say that they were only learners and that they would have the opportunity later of being appointed on the establishment. Yes, but what was the length of time that these youths had to wait. In Dublin they had had to wait in many instances fourteen months before they were appointed permanently; in Belfast they had to wait twelve months, in Cork ten months; in Derry and Limerick an indefinite period. They very often had to wait until some person died before they were taken on to the permanent staff. He would appeal to the noble Lord not to bring these young men into the service of the Post Office unless he could hold out the hope of some reasonable chance of promotion. The hon. Member for Dundee had instanced the case of a young lady who two years ago entered the service and was working still at the miserable salary of 5s. a week. She had not yet received a permanent appointment. That was not a system that should be allowed to go on. It was nothing less than sweating. It was a method of getting cheap labour, and he said that a big Department like the Post Office should be above such a system. They should be prepared to pay learners a proper salary, or not appoint them at all, unless within a reasonable period—say, three months. They should be paid a fair salary when they had to deal with valuable correspondence. There should not be a terrible temptation placed in their way. Young men were very often brought from country districts to London, Dublin, and other large cities, and they were not able to keep body and soul together on the wages they received. He hoped the noble Lord would pay attention to these grievances.

Another class he wished to call attention to was the dual workers. He had brought the case of these men before the noble Lord on several occasions. There were young men who came into the service and were supposed to be telegraphists and sorters. The practice was that these young men for twelve months were engaged in sorting. At the end of that period, if it suited the convenience of the controller or some other party, a young man who had been engaged as a sorter was clapped down at an instrument and he was expected to be as proficient and expert in the manipulation of the machine as if he had been continuously at the work. The noble Lord had stated that he considered it was the way for bringing about a competent and proper staff of men. With all due respect he might tell him that he had had some experience himself in the manipulation of a machine, and he knew that if a man were taken away from a machine he had been in the habit of manipulating and put back to it twelve months afterwards he would not be as expert at the work as if he had been continuously engaged at it. He did not think it was fair to these young men that that system should exist. The reply would be that it existed in London and all over England as well. That might be so, but he knew that it did not exist to the same extent as it was carried on in Ireland. He noticed from the Report of the Tweedmouth Commission that it was the intention then that the dual worker should get so many hours a day at the machine and so many hours sorting. The system of taking a man twelve months from the machine was not calculated to develop the service or to promote the interest of the public. What was the result? If a young man made a mistake he was hauled up before his superiors, a black mark was put against him, and he was probably on that account declared not eligible for promotion. It might be that he was not an expert operator and did not give the satisfaction expected. He held it was not in the interest of the service that such a system should be carried on. He quoted what the *Irish Times* and *Evening Mail* had said in condemnation of the system, pointing out that both of these papers generally supported the Government. He hoped the noble Lord would pay some deference to the opinions of these journals. He could quote from the *Freeman's Journal* to the same effect. The fact was that the whole Press of Dublin had complained over and over again with reference to the system of dual work. He had shown that it was not for the advantage either of the worker or of the public generally.

The hon. Member for Dundee had alluded to the long hours worked by the Post Office officials in Scotland, and the hon. Gentleman who preceded him spoke with reference to Christmas pressure. He wished to state to the Committee what was taking place every day in Dublin. It was promised at the time of the Tweedmouth Commission that split duties would be as far as possible abolished. He had brought this question before the noble Lord, who stated in reply that the promise had been complied with in Dublin. He could assure the noble Lord, from the information he had received, that the system did exist. He hoped the noble Lord when he heard the facts would not tolerate its continuance. It was no unusual thing in Dublin for men to go on duty at five in the morning and to be kept for two hours. After the pressure was over they were sent away, and they came back at eleven o'clock for two or perhaps three hours. They went away at two and came back at four to work on to eight. He asked any Member of the House to say whether that was a fair system, or one which should be tolerated in connection with the Postal Service. If the men were practically in the service of the Post Office from five in the morning till eight at night, what time had they to educate their minds, to take physical exercise, or, in fact, to do anything but go home and sit at the fireside or rest on the sofa? A Committee of this House was asked for last year to inquire into the grievances, but the noble Lord's predecessor did not rise to the occasion. Last year he stated that this question would come up year after year, and the time of the House would be wasted discussing it until it was taken up and dealt with in a thorough manner. The Postmaster-General had been spoken of in glowing terms, and he trusted that his term of office would be marked by reforms which would give satisfaction to all concerned. He did not wish to flatter the noble Lord, but he knew that he had a great name among postal servants. He hoped he would maintain that name by showing that he was anxious to ameliorate the condition of those in the service of the Post Office, making it what it should be, the model employer in the country. It was stated that these men were to get nine hours rest, but it was well known that in the United Kingdom there was no such system. In some cases they might get nine hours rest, but, as a general rule, this arrangement was not carried out as it should be.

The hon. Member for Dundee also complained with respect to Scotland of what there was also reason to complain of in Ireland, namely, the depletion of the staff. He was satisfied that it was not the Government who wished to do that. It was done by officials at the head of affairs who insisted on cutting down the staff in every possible direction, so as to show what economists they were. The result was that the messages were delayed, because there was no one present to answer the signal. Press messages were also delayed. That was a very serious matter, and should be dealt with immediately. Since the war broke out between Russia and Japan a special staff of men had been appointed in the Dublin office, but he believed it was the opinion of the supervisors that the additional staff found sufficient employment in dealing with the ordinary work. He himself had worked on into Sunday morning dealing with war telegrams, in the production of his paper and knew the pressure, and he insisted that it was not right that the public service should suffer in the way it did.

An even more important question he wished to raise was in reference to the manner of filling up the appointments in the post and telegraph service in Ireland. He had no hesitation in saying that intelligence and efficiency did not get the promotion they deserved. Favouritism was rampant in the service, and he declared that that had been proved up to the hilt. The noble Lord had been imposed upon by his under-officials in a recent case which he had brought before him, which was a perfect scandal. No encouragement was given to young men to look for promotion, which they had a right to expect. Last year, on the 23rd of March, he had brought this question about promotion before the noble Lord's predecessor. He was satisfied with the reply at the time; but he ought to have taken it with the proverbial grain of salt. The answers given by the Postmaster-General were really the answers of the subordinates in his office, and he thought that it was the duty of the Postmaster-General to go into these matters personally. On 7th May last he put another Question to the then Postmaster-General on the same subject, and the reply of the right hon. Gentleman was—

> "I have nothing to add to the answer which I gave to the hon. Member on this subject on 23rd March, beyond stating that the officer to whom he is supposed to refer has not been appointed to any superior grade. She has been lent temporarily to the Central Telephone Exchange, for work for which she has special qualifications."

Then on 19th April this year he put a Question on the same subject, and the noble Lord replied—

> "The lady to whom the hon. Member is understood to refer has been appointed to be first-class assistant supervisor in the Central Telephone Exchange, a post for which during her temporary employment at the Central Exchange she showed herself to be fully qualified."

He was not finding fault with the appointment, but with the favouritism displayed. This girl was appointed simply because she had strong friends at Court. Such a system should not be allowed to exist as appointing individuals over the heads of seniors who were equally qualified. He dwelt on this case because it showed how favouritism and nepotism were triumphant, how ability was discouraged, and efficiency was neglected. The *Telegraph Chronicle* commenting on this case said—

> "Pledges given in the House of Commons are set aside, and Postmasters-General are given answers at variance with facts. We commend this incident to Lord Stanley. He is young to the work, and is an honourable man. He should demand an explanation from his friends at the Central Telephone Office, as it is known that the lady in question boasted before she left the Central Telephone Office she was to be promoted to the rank of supervisor at the Telephone Exchange."

That was what was taking place in England, but something similar was occurring in Ireland at the same time. He would read an extract from a letter he had received from one of his own constituents—

> "As a direct result of the system of promotion, a set of men have got to the head of affairs in the Dublin Sorting Office who are not able to fill their duties creditably. An instance of this is their blundering incapacity in handling the American mails landed at Queenstown. The Cunard Company supplies a special service when the English portion of the mail is landed at Queenstown, yet the controller of the Dublin Sorting Office will not supply ample staff, with the result that large portions of every mail are sent unsorted to Liverpool and London. A man with no knowledge of the Dublin office was promoted to the rank of first-class assistant superintendent over the heads of all those senior to him on the clerks class, and over all those holding the rank of second-class assistant superintendent. This man has shown no special ability since he came to Dublin. He has never performed any duties of any importance without assistance, and at the present time he is performing a duty with the assistance and guidance of a Dublin-trained second-class assistant superintendent."

That was the manner in which in the service men with special qualifications were passed over. Character and ability stood for nothing. He was informed that in that case 117 men had been passed over who were senior to the man appointed. When he brought the subject before the House he was told that there was not one of these passed over who were suitable for promotion, and he said at the time that that statement was not correct. In those promotions reliable men in the clerks class and the second-class assistant superintendents had been passed over for junior men with less ability and experience. His correspondent further said that—

> "Quite a feature of the promotion was the selection of one of those who was principally concerned in the Corcoran defalcations. The controller who was censured in that case had his salary increased, and his *status* improved."

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Resolution to be reported upon Monday next; Committee also report Progress; to sit again this evening.

EVENING SITTING.

MILWR AND DISTRICT MINES DRAINAGE BILL [LORDS] (BY ORDER).

MR. McKEAN (Monaghan, S.) said that in the absence of the hon. Baronet who had intended to move this Instruction, the duty of so doing had fallen on himself. Mr. Deputy-Speaker, in his speech on Monday last, in support of the Second Reading of the Bill, had stated that if he thought the carrying out of this drainage scheme would in any way interfere with the water in St. Winifred's Well he would not vote for it, but to preclude such a possibility or to indemnify any sufferers against loss, a clause should be put into the Bill to safeguard them. Mr. Deputy-Speaker never spoke hastily; his words were weighed, and the suggestion he had made was considered by those who opposed the Bill a very valuable and important one. The Motion was designed to carry into effect that suggestion, and that being so, he failed to see how any person who voted for the Second Reading of the Bill could possibly oppose it. All it asked was that if the water supply of the town of Holywell was interfered with, or if the supply of this old time-honoured well, which was a great sanatorium resorted to by sufferers for the cure of diseases which baffled the skill of medical science, was cut off, and the water in the well diminished, the promoters of this Bill should pay compensation to those affected. The drainage scheme projected and carried out twenty years ago had materially interfered with the flow of water through St. Winifred's Well and depleted it to the extent of one million or a million and a half gallons per hour. The present drainage scheme was much more gigantic, and would be followed by infinitely more serious effects. He welcomed the opportunity of proposing this Instruction, because it afforded an opportunity to certain Gentlemen who, on Monday last he believed, voted against their principles, Gentlemen who on public platforms constantly spoke of "government by the people for the people," but who in this House overrode the will of the people; who advocated the principle of the greatest good for the greatest number, and who on the previous Monday voted for the greatest good for the fewest number.

MR. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green) formally seconded the Motion.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That it be an Instruction to the Committee on the Bill to insert clauses in the Bill providing for compensation water for the use of the riparian owners and other persons affected by the provisions of the Bill."—(*Mr. McKean.*)

MR. YERBURGH (Chester) expressed the opinion that the hon. Member for South Monaghan had misinterpreted the argument adduced by Mr. Deputy-Speaker on the Second Reading of this Bill, and submitted that what that argument really pointed to was that Mr. Deputy-Speaker did not think the evils suggested by the opponents to the Bill would accrue, but if their contention was proved then a clause should be inserted in the Bill to safeguard the interests of those affected. But whether the clause was necessary could only be proved in Committee. This Instruction would deprive the Committee of any freedom in dealing with this particular question. It gave them a mandate by which they were compelled holus-bolus to insert this clause. The hon. Member opposite had stated that since the present drainage scheme had been in operation the water in St. Winifred's Well had diminished. The figures which had been submitted to the House of Lords did not bear out that contention; those figures had not been challenged and he now tendered them as being accurate. From them it would be seen that in 1868, before the drainage scheme referred to had been passed, the supply of water to St. Winifred's Well was 19¼ tons per minute, in 1903 it was 19¾ tons per minute. Those figures showed that the drainage scheme now in operation had not affected the supply of water to St. Winifred's Well in the least. The whole question at issue was so complicated and so intricate that it was quite impossible for this House to arrive at a proper conclusion upon the matter. He therefore submitted that the proper course to pursue was to refer the matter to a Committee, before which evidence might be called, experts on water-supply examined and cross-examined, and the evidence on both sides heard. In that way and in that way alone could a proper decision be arrived at. The statements of the promoters on the one hand and the opponents of the Bill on the other were so contradictory that he ventured to submit to the House that they could not have any better proof of the necessity of the Bill being examined before a Committee, and he was quite certain they could trust this matter to a Committee with the greatest confidence.

SIR FREDERICK BANBURY (Camberwell, Peckham) said the argument put forward in support of the Instruction that some loss might be inflicted on certain people owing to the water being diverted from St. Winifred's Well was a good one if it could be supported by evidence, but the only place in which that argument could be proved was before a Committee upstairs. The proper course, therefore, would be to allow the Bill to go before the Committee in order to see whether that argument was well-founded. If this Instruction was carried it would be impossible to raise the argument at all, because the Instruction was a mandate to insert the clause. If the Committee did not do justice the hon. Gentleman opposite had his opportunity on Report, which was the proper occasion on which to advance the argument for the Instruction he now proposed. He entirely disagreed with the interpretation placed upon Mr. Deputy-Speaker's word by the hon. Member opposite, and agreed with the hon. Member for Chester that what Mr. Deputy-Speaker desired to convey to the House was the fact that if in Committee it was proved that loss would be inflicted in various directions by this Bill, a clause should be inserted to indemnify those concerned against any such loss. On these grounds he opposed the instruction.

MR. TOMKINSON (Cheshire, Crewe) said that the Bill, from what he had heard, would result in certain good to the mines, and there would be an increased amount of employment available. He hoped that the Bill would go to a Committtee as an open reference unfettered by any conditions.

THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (Mr. JEFFREYS, Hampshire, N.) said he hoped that the House would not carry this Instruction, as it would deprive the Committee upstairs of its freedom of action. Some remarks had been made as to what was said by the Chairman of Committees on Monday on the Second Reading of the Bill. He was authorised to say that the Chairman of Committees then stated that this was an engineering question, which should be left to the Committee upstairs, where evidence could be taken and a decision arrived at. If the Committee thought it necessary, after hearing the evidence, that a clause of this kind should be put in, they would have perfect liberty to do so, and it would certainly be an unusual thing to tie the hands of the Committee by giving them a mandatory Instruction of this kind.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 59; Noes, 122. (Division List, No. 123.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Boland, John
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Causton, Richard Knight
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cullinan, J.
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Dunn, Sir William
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Flynn, James Christopher
Hammond, John
Heath, James (Staffords. N.W.
Hobhouse, C.E.H.(Bristol, E.)
Hope,J.F(Sheffield, Brightside
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Hunt, Rowland
Jordan, Jeremiah
Joyce, Michael
Kilbride, Denis
Lambert, George
Lundon, W.
M'Calmont, Colonel James
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Murphy, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Partington, Oswald
Power, Patrick Joseph
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Robson, William Snowdon
Roche, John
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Smith, Samuel (Flint)

Sullivan, Donal
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, David Alfred(Merthyr

Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Weir, James Galloway
Whiteley, George (York, W.R
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. M'Kean and Mr. Flavin.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A. F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, RtHnHugh O.
Arrol, Sir William
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balcarres, Lord
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beach, Rt. Hon. Sir M. Hicks
Bignold, Arthur
Bigwood, James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Cavendish, V.C.W (Derbyshire
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chapman, Edward
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crossley, Rt. Hon. Sir Savile
Davies, Sir HoratioD(Chatham
Denny, Colonel
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dickson, Charles Scott
Doughty, George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Duke, Henry Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Fitzroy,Hon.Edward Algernon
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Groves, James Grimble
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton

Hamilton,Marq.of (L'nd'nderry
Harris, Dr. Fredk. R. (Dulwich
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Hermon-Hodge, Sir Robert T.
Horniman, Frederick John
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversham)
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. ArthurFred.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Jones, William(Carnarvonshire
Kennaway,Rt.Hn.Sir John H.
Knowles, Sir Lees
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Lawson, J. Grant (Yorks. N.R.
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Long,Col.Charles W.(Evesham
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Maconochie, A. W.
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Iver, Sir L. (Edinburgh, W.)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Mitchell, Edw. (Fermanagh, N.
Morrison, James Archibald
Mount, William Arthur
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murray,RtHnAGraham(Bute
Newdegate, Francis A. N.
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, Herb. Pike (Darlington)
Peel,Hn.Wm.Robert Wellesley
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne

Reid, James (Greenock)
Renwick, George
Ridley,Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Roe, Sir Thomas
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sandys, Lt.-Col. Thos. Myles
Saunderson, RtHn.Col.Edw.J.
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Shackleton, David James
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, RtHn.C.R(Northants
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J.M'Taggart
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strachey, Sir Edward
Stroyan, John
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Tomkinson, James
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Tuff, Charles
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Ure, Alexander
Valentia, Viscount
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney
Welby,Sir CharlesG.E(Notts.)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wodehouse, Rt Hn.E.R (Bath).
Wylie, Alexander

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Yerburgh and SirFrederick Banbury.

SUPPLY [9th Allotted Day].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. Lowther (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1904–5.

REVENUE DEPARTMENTS.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £6,400,618, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1905, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Post Office Services, the Expenses of Post Office Savings Banks, and Government Annuities and Insurances, and the Collection of the Post Office Revenue."

*Mr. NANNETTI, who was speaking when the sitting was suspended, continued his remarks. He said he also wished to bring under the attention of the Committee the case of the female telegraphic operators in Ireland. He had received a letter from one of the employees, in which she said—

> "I beg to draw your attention to what I consider two glaring injustices to female telegraphists in the Dublin General Post Office. I am writing to you, as girls from all parts of the country are affected, and I am certain that a few Questions asked by you in the House, or

even private inquiries from the Postmaster-General, would lead to some reform. (1.) Why are vacancies for female telegraphists in the Dublin General Post Office being frequently filled by girls who have not passed a Civil Service examination, limited or otherwise? By way of explanation I may inform you that daughters of superintendents and other high officials of the Department are brought into the office and taught to operate the instrument, and then put into the first vacancy that occurs without any further examination. The result is that examinations are few and far between in Dublin, and when one is announced it is for three or four vacancies. People who are paying grinders' fees to have their daughters trained for the examinations, which it is stated by the Treasury and Civil Service Commissioners is necessary to secure a Government situation, and that is permissible, are thus swindled by this system of influence at which the Department winks. Of course as long as no question is asked, incompetent persons, that is as regards passing a qualifying educational examination with outsiders, will continue to secure these positions, and will, with their influence in the Department, be pushed over the heads of those who have passed by open competition. (2.) How many applications were received from female telegraphists in the Dublin General Post Office for August, 1903, Bank Holiday, and how many of these applications were granted?"

If he gave the name of this lady he knew what would happen to her at the hands of the officials in Dublin; but he thought he was not asking too much when he asked the noble Lord the Postmaster-General to look into these matters. A Question had appeared on the Notice Paper, but he had not seen any answer to it, in reference to the appointment of postmasters in Ireland. There was a grievance that when any vacancies occurred in postmasterships, strangers were imported from England and Scotland to fill the places. He had no objection to Englishmen and Scotchmen being employed, but if Irish employees were competent for the position, it was only fair that they should receive the promotion to which they had a right.

He wished to draw attention to another matter which had created a great deal of soreness. When His Majesty was about to visit Ireland, the officials in Dublin knew that an additional staff would be necessary for the increased work. The officials in London, without consulting with the local authorities in Ireland as to whether they would be capable of coping with the pressure of work, sent over a staff of men from this country to Ireland. When he put a Question to the noble Lord on the subject, his reply was that on all occasions where there was a pressure of work, a number of specially trained men were appointed to do it. He had made inquiries since, and found that there was a great deal of truth in that; but what he wanted to know was, if ever they heard of a man coming from Ireland to England to meet emergencies. Why should they not have in Ireland, not only in Dublin, but in Belfast, Cork, and Limerick, a number of men who would be able to take up this special duty rather than bring over men from England? That was the way in which the difficulty might be met. People in Ireland felt very sore about this matter; they felt that it was a slight on their intelligence. During the motor race last year it was said that the telegraph system broke down. Yes, it broke down where the Englishmen were, at Ballyshannon, but not in Dublin where the Irishmen were. The supervisor went into a country of which he knew nothing and was put over the head of local men. During the time of the National Convention which was held in Dublin, there were more Press messages sent from that city than during the visits of their Majesties, and there was no hitch then, the local men being equal to the occasion, but during His Majesty's last visit there were complaints in reference to the delay of the Press telegrams from Punchestown and Leopardstown. On the occasion of the visit of Her late Majesty to Dublin there was not the slightest hitch, because the management was left in the hands of local men, and he believed that there were men in Dublin, Belfast, and Cork who were quite competent to do the work in times of pressure if they had a chance to do it. This was what the *Irish Times* said about the matter—

"The Royal visit is to be of a semi-private character, and there is not the slightest reason to suppose, given fair warning, that the Dublin telegraph staff is not in a position to respond to any call which may be made upon it. This practice of the introduction, temporarily, of Englishmen into an Irish public department is calculated to promote the impression that the earliest opportunity would be taken by the authorities to institute Englishmen to Irish appointments. One has only to look around and to note the number of Englishmen holding Post Office appointments in this country, and to contrast the number of Irishmen holding similar positions in England, to appreciate the fears of the Dublin telegraph staff."

That was from the *Irish Times*, a paper not likely to be prejudiced in this matter. He might say that the whole tenor of his remarks was directed to the fact that at the end he intended to ask the Postmaster-General to appoint a Committee to examine into and deal with the grievances of the Postal Service generally.

He had received many complaints from Ireland of the treatment of the postal officials there, and he now desired to refer to the case of Mr. Woods, whose grievance he had called attention to when this Vote was before the House in the previous year. Mr. Woods had been in the Postal Service sufficiently long to earn his pension, but, unfortunately for him, he fell into some little error in 1868 which brought the head of his department down upon him; he was reported on that occasion and he was fined, and therefore had paid the penalty for the offence he had committed. He believed the offence of which Mr. Woods was guilty was leaving his post without permission, but Mr. Woods' grievance was that he was tried behind his back, was not allowed to be heard in his own defence, and that even on conviction his superiors thought his case was so good that they never inflicted the penalty. In 1874, when the postal organisation was started, Woods became a member and signed a memorial which was sent to the Postmaster-General. At that time it was against the rules that such a thing should be done, and Woods was again punished. This method of approaching the Postmaster-General was later legalised, but this man was again punished. He was now out of the service in which he had been an exemplary officer; he discharged his duties with fidelity, and to the satisfaction of his superior officers. What he (Mr. Nannetti) desired to put to the Committee, was that those offences were so far back as 1868 and 1874, and that the man if he had committed them, was punished, but afterwards when he had qualified for a pension he was deprived of a portion of it because of those offences for which he had already been punished, and which were committed so long ago. He knew perfectly well that the answer the Postmaster-General would give was the stereotyped answer that was received from the right hon. Gentleman's subordinates. Another case was that of a young man a telegraphist in North Wall. He in some way brought down his superior officer upon him; he had committed some alleged paltry offence and at once his salary was reduced from 24s. to 20s. a week. He had no chance to defend himself, and his prospects were blighted by the miserable trumpery case which had been brought against him. The next case to which he desired to refer was the case of Scully. He did not defend Scully's conduct, but the system of petty tyranny which existed in the Irish post offices was of such a character that a highly strung young man like Scully was impelled to resent it. He admitted that Scully had committed a breach of discipline, but he submitted to the Committee that the postal officials should be men who could control their temper, and not lead by their actions a man into committing a breach of discipline. Scully was a man in the employ of the postal service; he was a competent and expert mechanic—a kind of engineer—and was the man who had been teaching all the other operatives in the service. The action which led to this breach of discipline was that he applied for a room in the post office which he might use for the purpose of teaching his class in engineering. He was met by his superior officer most contemptuously. His officer, pointing to an old store room, said, "You can have the store room to teach your class." Another instance which he had not before put before the Committee, but which showed the way in which young men were treated in the Postal Service, was that of a young man who applied to serve at the front at the time of the Boer War as a Volunteer. When he applied he was found to be too young and was put back, but when he again applied he was taken on. He was a youth of good parentage and it appeared that he had on entering the Yeomanry described himself as a Civil servant. There was no doubt that it was done in ignorance and that he imagined being employed by the Post Office that he was a Civil servant, but when one of the heads of the department, Mr. Pomeroy, heard of this he wrote to the superintendent and urged that the Yeomanry authorities should have their attention called to the subterfuge by which the young man had deceived them. To the credit of the superior officer it might be said that he told Mr. Pomeroy he had much better mind his own business. That showed the way in which the heads of the service behaved. The state of the Postal Service in Ireland was such that he appealed to the Postmaster-General to appoint a Committee to inquire into the whole of the grievances. The noble Lord had always treated him with kindness and courtesy, and it was because the noble Lord could not of himself know what was going on and always gave the stereotyped answer with which he was supplied, it was only with the object of calling attention to the necessity of thoroughly investigating these matters, that he moved a reduction of £100.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item A, 1, be reduced by £100, in respect of the Salary of the Postmaster-General."—(*Mr. Nannetti.*)

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD complained that the major portion of the debate had been occupied with small details, such as grievances of a local and personal character and going back as far as 1868. With regard to the general position, and particularly in matters which affected the men, he considered that the Postmaster-General had met them very fairly. They had been asked to wait for the Report which would shortly be published, and he believed that most Members of the House were prepared to do so. He suggested that small matters of detail could be dealt with very much better in the private room of the Postmaster-General, or by letter or other communication, than by occupying the time of the House which ought to be taken up with discussing important matters of principle. He thought that the Postal Department was probably the most backward Department of the whole of the Civil Service in regard to its general arrangements, and, in fact, in all respects. He would compare for a moment the organisation, facilities, and charges in the Postal Department with what they were in this country 230 years ago. In 1680 letters were carried eighty miles for 2d. There was a penny post in London, and letters and parcels up to 1lb. in weight were carried for a penny. There were hourly collections, and ten deliveries daily in the centre of London, and six in the suburbs. He thought it would be conceded in comparing that state of affairs with what we had to-day, that no very great improvement had taken place in the 230 years with regard either to the facilities or the charges of the Post Office. But what happened to the Postal Department? It unfortunately fell into the hands of men who paid so much to the State for farming out its rights, and eventually, a century or so later, it became a mere State Department, became what it was to-day, namely, a machine for collecting as much as possible out of the public, and giving the fewest possible facilities in return. He would illustrate that by comparing our position with that of other countries. There were many towns on the Continent where five communications could be sent for a penny. All over India communications could be sent for a penny, and in Japan 100 communications could be sent for that sum at a speed which, in a good many respects, compared very favourably with what was accomplished in this country. Taking into account the increased transit facilities and the lower cost of taking goods about the country, we ought to be able to send ten letters a day to all parts of the United Kingdom for a penny. He argued that no profit whatever should be exacted by this Department out of the trade of the country.

The evils and difficulties of this service all arose from mere profit-making. That was his contention, and to the extent that the receipts from the Post Office exceeded the expenses of carrying on the Department it was a tax. It was, moreover, a tax upon intercourse, commerce, and trade not collected in the guise of a tax, as all taxes ought to be. If the Postal Service was to make a surplus it was the first duty of the Department with that surplus to make an efficient and contented staff, and to do general justice to those in the employ of the Department, who to-day were amongst the most discontented, and properly discontented, Civil servants they had. In the next place, that surplus ought to be employed in giving increased facilities to the public and in reducing charges. In fact, the public who contributed the revenue of the Post Office should get the benefit. He might be asked where the State was to get the £4,000,000 odd which it would not get from the Post Office if they did not tax the trade, commerce, and intercourse of the country by collecting it as at present from the Postal Department. He simply referred those who asked that question to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham, who would probably be able to answer it a great deal better than he could.

*LORD STANLEY, in replying upon the discussion, said the last speaker had offered the most tempting prospect for any Postmaster-General. He had asked him to get rid of all his profits. If he could do that he believed he would be able to meet most of the demands put upon him. He declined to enter into the question of how to make good the £4,000,000 which they would lose if they did not make a profit on the Post Office arrangements. He would deal first with the speech of the hon. Member for Dublin. First of all, as to the appointments in which he said that men were passed over. He wished the House to understand clearly the position when men were passed over. They were passed over with his authority after he had seen all the papers concerned. If they were going to proceed upon the principle of seniority in preference to efficiency they would perhaps stop any chance of favouritism, but at the same time they would not find it to the advantage of the public service. Wherever they wanted efficiency they must not select by seniority, but choose the men most fitted, and whenever they did that they would invariably find that those men who were passed over would not admit that they were not capable of fulfilling the task; and of course they thought it was favouritism. That, however, was not the case. All these cases were brought before his notice personally, and he could assure hon. Members that no favouritism was shown, and he always endeavoured to select for positions, in the public interest, the men who were best capable of fulfilling the task. The hon. Member had referred to the class of postmasters who he alleged were appointed from England into Ireland over the heads of Irishmen in the postal services. Apparently the hon. Member did not recognise that the postal service was one where there was no distinction of country made, and promotion was made irrespective of where a man was serving; and the fact of a place being located in Ireland did not debar an Englishman or a Scotchman from being appointed any more than it debarred an Irishman from being appointed to a post in England or Scotland. He believed that in the last ten years as regards post-masterships nineteen men had gone from England to Ireland and twelve had come from Ireland to England. He was only speaking of men who had been transferred from England to Ireland and *vice versâ*. He did not think these numbers showed the inequality assumed by the hon. Member for Dublin. The hon. Member had also referred to learners being kept for a long time on low wages before they came on to the establishment. These men were taken on as learners on the distinct understanding, which they thoroughly realised, that they could only be appointed to established posts as those posts became vacant. He agreed that it was not a good thing for them to be kept too long at learning, and he should endeavour to go into the question as to whether they could not reduce the number of learners so as to enable the established post to be reached after a shorter period of service than at the present time. The hon. Member had also referred to dual workers. As a general rule he did not think dual working was a very good thing, but there were no doubt many cases where the practice of dual working saved a worse evil and that was split duties. The hon. Member for Dublin had mentioned cases in Ireland — he presumed he meant Dublin — where the men were employed twelve months on postal work, and then put for twelve months on telegraph work. He would undertake to look into those cases, because he thought that was a wrong practice, and he would inquire into the matter with the view of stopping such a practice if possible.

*MR. NANNETTI said he did not object to the men learning both sorting and postal duties, but he thought it was unfair to the men to keep them for such a long time away from practice on the telegraphic instrument, and then suddenly send them back again and expect them to be as proficient as if they had been at that particular work the whole time.

*LORD STANLEY said he was fully in accord with the views of the hon. Member on that point, and he would see what he could do in the matter. There were many other questions, but perhaps hon. Members would forgive him if on that occasion he did not go further into detail. With regard to the case of Mr. Woods whose pension had been reduced, as a matter of fact the cause of the reduction was not that referred to by the hon. Member. In all cases of pensions they were awarded by the Treasury, and those pensions depended upon a man's good conduct throughout his career, and all the facts of an important nature which appeared against a man's character had to be brought to the notice of the Treasury, and in this particular instance it was numerous irregularities, including one in the course of his last year of service, that were the cause of the reduction of his pension. With reference to the man Scully he thought the hon. Member opposite was a little ungrateful, because on a former occasion he had dealt with that case very fully and he thought he had met the hon. Member as fairly as he possibly could in making an allowance for what might be considered an excusable outburst of temper.

He would now deal with some of the questions raised by the hon. Member for Canterbury. In one in particular he sympathised entirely with the hon. Gentleman, but he confessed he could not himself see any remedy in connection with it. It was the question of dealing with lottery circulars. There was nothing he would like more than to stop the delivery of these lottery circulars, but he did not see how he could deal with them. In Canada the post office authorities had the power to open letters; but he should not like to see that power taken in this country. At one time in his life it was his duty to look through letters, and the duty was most disagreeable. He would be very much averse to any power being vested in the Post Office authorities which would give rise to the suspicion in anyone's mind that his letters were tampered with in the Post Office. The evil of the lottery tickets was great, but the remedy proposed would be a greater evil still. The hon. Member also suggested that a man who had posted a letter by mistake should be allowed, on proper identification, to recall it. That plan would be attended with such serious risks that he did not think it would be approved in this country. With regard to the question of accumulated poundage on postal orders, he agreed that on occasion it was a hardship, though he did not think that a postal order should be allowed to pass from hand to hand for an indefinite time like a bank note. He would like to make an alteration in the present system, but he was met with the difficulty that it would require an Act of Parliament. An Act of Parliament also provided that an embossed stamp removed from its envelope could not be used for postage purposes, but in cases where the envelope bearing the embossed stamp had been torn, or for any other reason was rendered useless, if application was made the money would be refunded. He had also been urged to see to the reduction of the postage on newspapers to China. No doubt the rates charged over the Siberian Railway were excessive, but this was hardly the time to negotiate for the reduction of the rate on newspapers sent by that route into China. The hon. Member was mistaken in regard to the charge for telegrams to France. The minimum charge for a telegram to France was 10d. and from France to this country it was one franc. Therefore the hon. Member was entirely wrong, because as far as possible the charges in both countries were the same. The hon. Member for Canterbury had alluded to the grievance of reply-paid telegraph forms not being allowed to be used after three months; he would point out that, as all telegrams were destroyed after three months, this regulation was necessary to prevent the fraud that would be possible if the post office authorities were unable to refer to the original telegrams. With regard to the case mentioned by the hon. Member for Dundee there were certain points and recommendations made with which he was not entirely satisfied, and he had referred the matter back in order that certain points might be cleared up before he came to a decision. He thought he had now as far as possible dealt with all the points which had been put to him.

MR. BAYLEY asked the noble Lord if he could make any statement in regard to the sanitary arrangements of post offices.

*LORD STANLEY said the sanitary arrangements of post offices was a point upon which he would be glad to make a statement. He admitted that the sanitary arrangements of many of the post offices which he had himself seen were certainly not all that could be desired. In many of them to attempt to make the sanitary arrangements really good and in accordance with modern ideas was practically impossible, and the only way to deal with them was to pull the buildings down altogether and erect new buildings on modern lines. That, as far as they possibly could, they were doing, but the delays which occurred in consequence of the difficulty of getting suitable land and making all the necessary arrangements were very great, and they were not able to progress as rapidly in this matter as he should like. He was perfectly ready whenever any case was brought to his notice to consider the matter, and the two cases which had been brought forward by the hon. Member should have a special inspection of them made. He did not think it would be right in all cases to call in a factory inspector, although he was ready to do this whenever it was necessary; and in cases where he had any reasonable doubt as to the state of things and where he thought it would have a good effect he should have no hesitation whatever in asking the Home Office to redeem the promise they gave last year, and to lend their factory inspectors to make such inspections as he might deem necessary.

MR. BAYLEY asked in cases where it was alleged that insanitary conditions prevailed would the noble Lord give the hon. Member representing that constituency permission to inspect the sanitary conditions himself.

*LORD STANLEY said he could hardly promise to do that, and he preferred to have the cases looked into himself. With regard to the question of a universal penny postage which had been alluded to by the hon. Member for Canterbury he was afraid that he could not hold out any prospects at the present time of such a proposal being universally adopted throughout the world. At present we must be content with having a penny post with our Colonies—only one more link in the chain was required—and of giving them and receiving from them a preference. He was afraid that it was not in his power to hold out any hope, at all events this year, of carrying out any such proposal.

*MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty) said that the hon. Member for Liverpool had referred to a question raised by an hon. Member from Ireland which might be a trivial matter to Liverpool, but was one of vital importance to the small towns and villages in Ireland. He thought the hon. Member for Liverpool had wandered very much from the practical side of the question. He stated that ten communications could be sent in Japan for 1d., but the hon. Member forgot to tell the Committee that the people there lived very differently from the people in this country. Their food consisted largely of rice and a little fish. The conditions of life were altogether different; the houses, scrupulously clean, contained little or no furniture, and in the warm weather, many of the toilers were attired in nature's garb or a cheap kimona. Even the blind, who live on charity in this country, earn their living by engaging as masseurs and masseuses, massage being much in favour in Japan and at a cost within the reach of all classes of the community.

*THE CHAIRMAN: That is a question rather far away from the Post Office Vote.

*MR. WEIR thought he might safely refer to one or two other matters. The hon. Member for Liverpool had spoken of the £4,000,000 profit which was made annually by the Post Office, but apparently the hon. Member was not aware that a very few years ago the Chancellor of the Exchequer set aside out of the Post Office revenue £700,000 for the extension of postal facilities in the rural districts. He was pleased to say that whenever he had approached the noble Lord, he had found him most courteous, and he not only made promises but gave effect to his promises. They must give the noble Lord time to carry out reforms. He was glad to see that £5,000 a year had been given for gratuities to sub-postmasters and sub-postmistresses and auxiliary postmen. Many of those faithful servants had worked for years, and when they were too old to carry on their duties it was precious rough on them to be cast off without a sixpence. The noble Lord had made a very good start in this direction, and he hoped that in future years he would be able to increase that sum to £15,000 or £20,000. They had also been told that the noble Lord was making some arrangements for wireless telegraphy, and that he objected to monopolies, and particularly the monopoly of the National Telephone Company.

*The CHAIRMAN: Order, order! That question does not arise on this Vote.

*Mr. WEIR said the noble Lord had referred to the question.

*Lord STANLEY said that what he stated was that he was glad the other Vote had been postponed, because it would enable him to make a statement upon that question.

*Mr. WEIR said the noble Lord had expressed a desire to extend the use of motor cars in the Post Office service, and he trusted he would be able to give full effect to that desire. He did not think the noble Lord could have a better field for his experiments than in the Highlands of Scotland.

Colonel LOCKWOOD (Essex, Epping) said he wished to revert to a point which considerably concerned the public convenience. It would be within the memory of the Committee that there was a service called the District Messenger Service, which had before now come into collision with the Post Office, but they had always been anxious to give the public the best service they could at a small profit. Recently the manager of the District Messenger Service went to America, and there he saw an invention of great service, and he brought it back with him to this country. The improvement was that instead of ringing the bell and waiting, as they had to do now for the messenger to arrive, there was a telephone attachment to the dial, so that after ringing they could speak directly to the man in the office and ask if he could send a messenger at once or how long he would have to wait for one. By this arrangement the person was not kept waiting until the messenger arrived. He understood that the District Messenger Service manager had submitted this improvement to the Postmaster-General and asked for his sanction, but the noble Lord had refused it on the general ground that the telephone attachment to be employed was an infringement of the Post Office telephone monopoly. He would not go so far as to flatly contradict that assertion; but he would point out that it was not likely to be used, even if it could be used, as a competitor to the Post Office telephone. It was a very reasonable improvement on a very useful service, and he trusted that the Postmaster-General would see his way to reconsider his decision on a further examination of the matter.

*Mr. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland) said he desired to allude to the question of betting circulars. He thought it was often the case that those betting circulars came over wholesale from the Continent, and they were then posted with a halfpenny stamp all over the country. He hoped the Postmaster-General would be able to put a stop to the circulation of betting circulars.

*Lord STANLEY said that if they bore only a halfpenny stamp they would be open documents and the Post Office would stop them from going out. But, as a matter of fact, they were sent out with a penny stamp and sealed. He had been asked whether, when they were brought into the office in blocks, as was often the case, he could not demand that one of them should be opened in the presence of his representative so that he might ascertain their character. He would not like to say that that was impossible, but he was afraid it was not a feasible plan. He wished it were.

*MR. CATHCART WASON said he received most objectionable circulars. He thought many of them came from Holland. He did not see why the public should pay a penny for letters and the Post Office should be overburdened with perfectly useless circulars sent for a halfpenny. The Post Office tried to do too much for the public. The question of the parcels post cash on delivery had been raised, and he was glad to hear that the noble Lord was going to make inquiries. He thought it would be a very serious thing for poor men who had to carry those mail bags and circulars if the system spoken of was adopted. He strongly protested against the delivery of letters on Sundays. Postmen in the rural districts practically never had a holiday. They got on without Sunday deliveries in London, but all over Scotland and other parts of the country postmen were at work on Sundays. He did not know what the Sunday Observance Society had done in this matter, but he was quite sure that nothing would please the whole countryside more than abolishing the Sunday delivering of letters. Surely people could do without their letters and newspapers being delivered on Sunday, and they might conduct their correspondence on Monday morning. The people were not so wrapt up in business that they could not wait for one day in the week. If hon. Members could only see the difficulties under which rural postmen lived the House would declare that Sunday should be a free day for postmen as well as for other classes of servants. The hon. Member for Liverpool suggested that the Post Office should do without that £4,000,000 profit. He did not know whether the hon. Member would be in favour of putting 2d. on the income-tax, or 2d. more on tea and tobacco, to make good this loss to the revenue, but he thought the hon. Member would be wise to leave matters as they were at the present time. With regard to the mail service, he understood that they were now paying £9,000 for a service to East Africa. He hoped the noble Lord would look into that matter in order to see that he was getting fair value for his money. He was not going to raise a very bitter question concerning the Orkney mails as the noble Lord had promised to look thoroughly into it, but the delivery of the mails to Orkney was very irregular, and they were frequently delayed simply to oblige a few tourists. He knew that the difficulties were very great under the ordinary circumstances of navigation and the stormy weather, but it was an intolerable state of things that the railway companies could simply laugh at the noble Lord and everybody else and deliver the mails exactly as they pleased. That was a matter which the noble Lord could easily remedy. For instance last year going to Orkney he arrived up to time at Thurso but was detained there for hours waiting for a second train and did not arrive till midnight, and this constantly took place and were matters which were occurring every day in the week in Scotland, and he trusted the Postmaster-General would recognise the inconvenience and the difficult position in which the people of Scotland were placed in consequence of the irregularity in the delivery of the mails. He trusted the noble Lord would inquire into the whole subject and see if he could not compel the railway companies to carry out their obligations.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.) called attention to the low rate of payment made to sub-postmasters. The noble Lord was aware that these men did a very considerable portion of the work of the Post Office. There were 2,800 of them in Ireland, and they were only paid £23 per annum, including salary and commission. There were in England, Ireland, and Scotland 20,000 sub-postmasters and the total salary and commission paid to them was £588,000, whereas 875 postmasters were paid £29,000. He thought this was a matter which the noble Lord might very well look into. As showing how unfairly sub-postmasters were treated, he instanced a case where the sub-postmaster of a town resigned his office in a large measure because the income did not pay for the service rendered. The official who was sent to take his place received £3 16s. a week. or, in other words, the sub-postmaster who resigned was only paid one-seventh of the amount of the man who came after him. A case had been brought under his notice where the total turnover of the Post Office for a year was £3,500, but the salary and commission of the postmaster in charge only amounted to £35 a year. He thought the class of sub-postmasters ought to be kept in view by the noble Lord when he was distributing the balance that remained. They were men whose claims ought to receive very careful consideration, because of the excellent work they were doing and the long hours during which they were employed. They were sometimes employed from eight in the morning until eight at night. He thought it should not be said in answer that when one of these offices became vacant a dozen or more people were ready to take it up. That was not the principle on which a great department like the Post Office should select the men who had to do this responsible work. The first condition of service was that the men should be efficient, and being efficient they should get a reasonable wage for the work they had to discharge. He hoped the noble Lord would look carefully into this matter and see whether anything could be done. For some time they had been pressing the noble Lord and his predecessor to make the Irish language an optional subject in the examination for the Post Office. This was not merely a question of sentiment with the Irish Members. He did not ask that English postal officials should know Irish, but there were thousands of men in Ireland at the present time to whom Irish was the language used in their ordinary commercial business, and that should be a reason for giving favourable consideration to the suggestion he had made. He had received a number of letters complaining of the delay or non-delivery of letters written in Irish, and he considered it essential that sorters should know the language.

*MR. THEODORE TAYLOR (Lancashire, Radcliffe) said he wished to call the attention of the Committee to the charges in connection with the parcels post between this and other countries. In that matter the Postmaster-General had a fine opportunity of distinguishing his occupation of office by some very much-needed reform. He asked the noble Lord to appoint a small Departmental Committee to inquire into the anomalies of the foreign parcel post rates. Thus, the rate for the carriage of a parcel of 11lb. from this country to Germany was 2s., whilst from Germany to this country it was 1s. 5d. From Germany to Italy it was also 1s. 5d., but from England to Italy it was 2s. 6d. The charge for sending a parcel from England to Malta, one of our own Colonies, was 3s., against 2s. from Germany and 1s. 6d. from France, whilst if the parcel was sent by the overland route from England the charge was as much as 4s. Again, the rate from Germany to New South Wales was 4s. 5d., and from England to New South Wales 6s. It cost 3s. to send a parcel of 11lb., presumably carried by British steamers, from this country to the United States, against 2s. 1d. from Switzerland, in the centre of Europe. The other day a parcel was sent from Sheffield to Bury at the cost of 11d. It could have been sent from Dantzic to Venice or from Bremen to Buda-Pesth for 6d. This was scarcely the way to encourage British trade. Referring to the Postal Guide the hon. Member said it was far behind that of some foreign countries. It had been stated that 250 years ago letters could be sent for a penny, but the comparison was not quite fair to the Postmaster-General, because labour was cheaper then. But if there were these facilities 250 years ago, the fact only indicated that we had not progressed so much as we might have done. He suggested that the Postmaster-General should consider the advisability of establishing halfpenny local posts. Such a system would not cause much loss to the general revenue, but it would be a great convenience and a great public service. He believed that a local halfpenny post, within well-defined limits, in large cities, would ultimately pay, and so pave the way towards a general halfpenny inland post, which would get rid of all the present humbug as to what was and what was not a closed letter.

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton) expressed the hope that the Postmaster-General would be able to allow a discussion of all the grievances of the postal servants when they received the Committee's Report. There were only 40,000 out of 130,000 of the employees dealt with in the inquiry by the Committee, and those who were beyond the purview of the Committee had grievances which ought to be considered. There were a certain number of men who had practically abandoned their right to promotion when they undertook Sunday work in London, and they were told that that work would bring them a certain amount of money. For many years they did that work, and then the duties were re-arranged, with the result that they were told they would only be allowed to work on alternate Sundays. They now found themselves deprived of a certain amount of salary which the authorities led them to expect when the men agreed to forego promotion; and he hoped that in allocating the £5,000 to which his noble friend referred, their claim to compensation would be considered. His noble friend might not be able, at the moment, to give him an answer, but he could assure him that he would not have brought the question forward had he not thoroughly investigated it and satisfied himself of the justice of the demand. He hoped that his noble friend, who was a broad-minded man, would not deal with the matter in any narrow spirit. He would also ask his noble friend if he would lay on the Table the Report of the Departmental Committee on the Indian Mail Service.

MR. O'MALLEY (Galway, Connemara) said he wished to direct attention to the condition of postal matters in his constituency. They all recognised that the Postmaster-General was very sympathetic and that he desired to remedy any grievance brought to his attention; but the noble Lord was not responsible for many of the grievances of which they complained. He could personally not complain of any want of courtesy on the part of the present or previous Postmaster-General. The Duke of Norfolk had promised when Postmaster-General to do everything in his power to remedy the grievances of which he complained, but no improvement had yet been effected. For instance, the mails in Connemara were still carried by car, although a railway was now running through the district. As a result, the delivery of letters was very late, which was a great hardship, not only on the inhabitants, but also on the English tourists who visited Connemara in the summer months. The reply he had received was that it would cost too much to carry the mails by train and would not pay. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Canterbury referred to the meanness of the Post Office, and he certainly thought that they were acting meanly in this matter. The inhabitants and the visitors to Connemara should not be deprived of proper postal facilities even if they would cost a few hundred pounds. He hoped the noble Lord would look into the matter. There was one question he would ask the noble Lord and that had reference to the agricultural parcel post. He wished to know if anything was to be done to facilitate such a post in Ireland. Efforts were being made to revive small industries in Ireland, and nothing would encourage that so much as an agricultural parcels post.

*MR. SLACK (Hertfordshire, St. Albans) said he wished to direct attention to a small reform which would prove remunerative to the Revenue and profitable to the State, namely, a revision of the postal rates charged on magazines and other publications. There was an immense growth in this class of literature, but the present prohibitive rates prevented a number of magazines from being sent by post. He knew that "Review" and Library copies were largely delivered by hand by London publishers instead of through the Post. He would ask the noble Lord to effect a reform in that direction. He would also wish to direct attention to the postal rates for magazines and newspapers between England and the Colonies. The magazine postal rate between England and Canada was 4d. per lb., whereas between Canada and the United States it was only 1d. That gave American literature a great advantage, and he thought one of the objects of the Government should be to encourage the sale of current

English literature in the Colonies, as one easy method of knitting more closely together the bonds of Empire.

*LORD STANLEY said that with reference to the question regarding the use of the telephone by the District Messenger Service which was mentioned by his hon. and gallant friend he would look into the matter again. He viewed with the greatest suspicion anything which might infringe the monopoly possessed by the Post Office. He would do everything he possibly could to ensure the convenience of the general public, but at the same time he was very much afraid of the thin end of the wedge being introduced. With regard to the question of the parcels post, it was rather a complicated subject, and he candidly confessed he was not very cognisant of the details; but the hon. Gentleman's statement on the subject was not as accurate as it would appear to be. Under the Parcels Post Convention, to which the United Kingdom did not belong, there was a uniform rate up to 11lbs. but the Post Office, having to pay 55 per cent. of the charges to the railway companies, could not come into the Convention on the same terms as foreign countries where the railways were State-owned. The Post Office had graduated charges. Up to 3lbs., which was the general weight of parcels, those charges were considerably lower than foreign rates; and altogether it would be found that their charges did not compare unfavourably with the rates charged by foreign countries. Again the necessity for sea transit between this country and any other country made the rates more expensive than if it were only a case of crossing a frontier. He was quite ready to look into the matter, and see what could be done; but he thought the Post Office was now doing all that could reasonably be expected of it, considering it was tied down by Acts of Parliament and had to pay 55 per cent. of the rates it charged to the railway companies. His hon. friend the Member for Hoxton asked him to give a solatium out of the £5,000 he had mentioned to certain men in the General Post Office. These men, however, had not got the case which his hon. friend attempted to make out for them. They had been employed for seven days a week, and he thought the Committee would agree that it was not possible for men so employed to give efficient service; and a rule was adopted that they should not be allowed to work every Sunday, but should be allowed to work every alternate Sunday. He thought that was perfectly right in the interests of the men themselves and for the efficiency of the service. In any case they had no claim on the £5,000, which was provided for entirely different purposes. His hon. friend asked him if he would lay on the Table of the House the Report of the Departmental Committee which inquired into the Eastern Mail Service. He would be very happy to lay it on the Table. With regard to the magazine rates of postage he confessed he was not conversant with the subject, but he would look into it and see what could be done. As regarded the agricultural parcels post, he would inquire into that matter also. He hoped the Committee would now allow the Vote to be taken.

* MR. NANNETTI said that after the noble Lord's statements he asked leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Original Question put, and agreed to.

And, it being Midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Resolution to be reported upon Monday next; Committee to sit again upon Monday next.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING (LONDON) BILL.

Ordered, That Mr. Bamford Slack, Mr. Bousfield, and Mr. Hayden be Members of the Select Committee.—(*Sir A. Acland-Hood.*)

Adjourned at five Minutes after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Friday, 13th May, 1904.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Trafford Park Dock and Railway Bill [H.L.]; Stretford Urban District Council Bill [H.L.]; Manchester Corporation (General Powers) Bill [H.L.]; Manchester Corporation Tramways Bill [H.L.]. Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Earl of Kimberley be proposed to the House as a Member of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Earl of Yarborough; read, and agreed to.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with:—Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) [H.L.].

Also the Certificate that no Standing Orders are applicable to the following Bill:—Canal Rates and Charges (Regents Canal) Order Confirmation [H.L.].

And also the Certificates that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with:—Great Central Railway; Doncaster Corporation.

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

Trafford Park Dock and Railway Bill [H.L.]. A witness ordered to attend the Select Committee.

De Trafford Estate Bill [H.L.]. The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that in pursuance of Standing Order No. 163A relating to Private Bills, he had on the requisition of the Chairman of Committees appointed William Howard Winterbotham, Esq., of the Royal Courts of Justice, Official Solicitor to the Supreme Court of Judicature, as guardian or protector of the infants Humphrey Edmund de Trafford; Rudolph Edgar Francis de Trafford; Raymund Vincent de Trafford; Hubert Edmund Francis de Trafford; Geoffrey Edmund de Trafford; Reginald Francis de Trafford; Sicell Noel de Trafford; Ralph Eric de Trafford; Herman St. Michael de Trafford; Oswald de Trafford; Robert Ashton de Trafford; Edward Aloysius de Trafford; Cuthbert de Trafford; Timothy John Aloysius O'Brien, Robert Rollo Gillespie O'Brien; George Gilbert Joseph Clifford; Walter Francis Joseph Clifford; and Lewis Arthur Joseph Clifford, named in the Bill, to represent such infants before the Committee on the Bill.

Bristol Corporation Bill [H.L.]. Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

Holywood Tramways Bill [H.L.]. Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

North Wales Electric Power Bill [H.L.]. Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

Chippenham Gas Bill; Amersham, Beaconsfield, and District Water Bill. Reported, with Amendments.

Hutchesons' Hospital and Hutchesons' Educational Trust Bill [H.L.]. Report from the Select Committee, That it is not expedient to proceed further with the Bill; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

Great Northern Railway Bill. The Lord BALFOUR informed the House that the opposition to the Bill was withdrawn. The order made on the 25th of April last was discharged, and Bill committed.

Metropolitan Railway Bill [H.L.]; West Metropolitan Railway (Abandonment) Bill [H.L.]. Commons Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Harrow Road and Paddington Tramways Bill. Read 2ª, and committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

Donegal Railway Bill. Read 2ª, and committed.

Whitby Gas Bill. Read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

Byth and Cowpen Gas Bill. Read 3ª, with the Amendments; further Amendments made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member

Plymouth Corporation Bill. Brought from the Commons; read 1^a; and referred to the Examiners.

Wellington (Somerset) Gas Bill; Kettering Improvement Bill. Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [H.L.]. Committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill [H.L.]. Committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

Metropolitan Police Provisional Order Bill. Read 3^a (according to order), and passed.

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill [H.L.]. House in Committee (according to order). Bill reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3^a on Monday next.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRANSVAAL.

Further correspondence relating to the Transvaal Labour Importation Ordinance (in continuation of [Cd. 1986], March, 1904).

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND).

Selection of circular letters of the Scotch Education Department, 1898–1904; with explanatory memorandum.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

No. 3159. United States (New York).

No. 3160. Turkey (Trebizond).

NEW ZEALAND.

Correspondence relating to the Preferential and Reciprocal Trade Act, 1903.

EDUCATION COMMISSIONERS (IRELAND).

Annual Report for the year 1903.

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.

Kent and East Sussex Light Railway (General Powers) Order, 1904. Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, amending the Cranbrook and Tenterden Light Railway Order, 1899; and for other purposes.

Aldershot and Farnborough Light Railway (Amendment) Order, 1904. Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, amending the Aldershot and Farnborough Light Railway Order, 1902.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

INDIA.

Home Accounts. Home Accounts of the Government of India.

Estimate. Estimate of revenue and expenditure of the Government of India, for the year 1903–1904, compared with the results of 1902–1903.

Finance and Revenue Accounts. Finance and Revenue Accounts of the Government of India, for the year 1902–1903.

PRISONS (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1877, AND SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND ACTS, 1885–89.

Rule made by the Secretary for Scotland as to the constitution of the visiting committee to Inverness Prison.

INEBRIATES ACTS, 1879 TO 1899 (REGULATIONS FOR STATE INEBRIATE REFORMATORIES).

Regulations made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, in pursuance of the Inebriates Act, 1898, for the management and discipline of State inebriate reformatories.

LIGHTHOUSES, ETC. (LOCAL INSPECTIONS).

Reports to the Board of Trade by the Trinity House of Deptford Strond, the Commissioners of Northern Lighthouses, and the Commissioners of Irish Lights, of their inspection of local lights, buoys, and beacons (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 176, of Session 1903).

PATENTS, DESIGNS, AND TRADE MARKS.

Twenty-first Report of the Comptroller-General of Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks, with Appendices, for the year 1903.

RAILWAY AND CANAL TRAFFIC ACT. 1888.

Report by the Board of Trade, in accordance with Section 24, Sub-section (4), of the above Act, on the schedule of maximum rates and charges to be made applicable to the canals of the Regents Canal and Dock Company.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

FEE FUND OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid on the Table the Annual Account of the Fee Fund of the House of Lords. The same was ordered to lie on the Table, and to be referred to the Select Committee on the House of Lords Offices.

BILLS OF EXCHANGE ACT, 1882, AMENDMENT BILL [H.L.].

House in Committee (according to order). Bill reported without Amendment, and re-committed to the Standing Committee.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES (METRIC SYSTEM) BILL [H.L.].

House in Committee (according to order). The Amendments proposed by the Select Committee made; further Amendments made. Standing Committee negatived. The Report of Amendments to be received on Monday next; and Bill to be printed as amended. (No. 76.)

THE NEW SERVICE RIFLE.

*LORD TWEEDMOUTH rose to call attention to defects apparent in the new service rifle; and to ask His Majesty's Government whether gauges and specifications have yet been sent out to private firms for its manufacture, what is the explanation of the high price, £4 10s. per rifle, which it has been announced such firms are to receive; whether it has been decided to issue the weapon in its present form to all branches of the defence services, and how long a time will elapse before the re-armament of His Majesty's forces will be complete. He said: My Lords, I can assure His Majesty's Government that I do not raise this question in any captious or Party spirit. It is a subject that I have long taken an interest in, and I am only too anxious to do anything I can to secure the best weapon possible for the British Army. I should have liked to have raised this question rather sooner, but it is only within the last fortnight that I managed to get the loan of one of the new rifles, and I was desirous of handling it and firing a few shots out of it before raising the question in your Lordships' House. I think I ought also to say that I have a strong predisposition in favour of the bolt action and magazine applied to the many forms of Mauser rifle, which I believe to be preferable to the form which the British Army have adopted.

I have not come here to say that the new rifle is a bad weapon, or that it is a shame to put British soldiers in the field armed with it. I thoroughly admit that the new rifle is a good one, but I do not admit that it is the best; and I hold that we ought not to be content with having merely a good rifle, but ought to have absolutely the best rifle that it is possible to produce, and not only the best rifle at the moment, but the rifle that will afford the best basis on which to graft further improvements. I have seen it constantly stated in the newspapers that a great drawback of the new rifle is the amount of its recoil. I admit that there is a perceptible increase in the recoil, but it remains so small that for all practical purposes it need not be considered. I should not estimate it at more than a quarter of that in the Martini-Henri. There are other points in which improvement has undoubtedly been made in the present weapon as compared with the Lee-Enfield. In the first place, it is a good pound lighter which in itself is an important consideration; but I doubt whether, in so far as that lightening has been obtained by the shortening of the barrel by five inch, it is altogether an advantage. Then you have for the first time on a British weapon the old ladder-leaf back-sight abolished and a notched stem back-sight introduced. That is an enormous improvement. Again, it has at last been decided to adopt the method of loading with a charger, so that five cartridges are put into the magazine by a single movement, which is a great improvement. Further, it has been decided to issue the rifle with stocks of three different sizes. That, again, is a great improvement, because each man, according to his physical build, will be, to some extent at any rate, fitted with a weapon suitable to himself.

So far I have said nothing but good of the new rifle. Now I come to some criticisms, and I may take them under five heads: the barrel, the sights, the breech action, the magazine, and the stock. The barrel is, of course, the most important part of a rifle, and also the most delicate. It is claimed, I know, that the new rifle—I am not speaking of this particular new rifle, but of the Enfield barrel—will stand 8,000 shots fired out of it. I cannot believe that. My own experience is that you really cannot trust in the accuracy of a ·303 barrel, even for deer-stalking purposes, for more than three years, and that not on account of the number of shots fired through it, but because of the extraordinarily destructive nature of the explosive used. The effect of the explosion of cordite is to send through the barrel a pillar of white-hot fire at a temperature exceeding that of the melting temperature of steel. It leaves deposits of a most harmful character, and the life of the barrel is very rapidly brought to a close by the erosive and corrosive effect of the explosive itself. I maintain that one of our first objects in selecting a rifle ought to be to decide on such a form as will render it easy to replace the barrel, and we should also secure that the action on which the barrel is built up will stand a greater strain, if that is required by the development of ammunition. The barrel in the new rifle has been shortened by five inches. That has been done partly to lighten the rifle and to make it more convenient for use by mounted men. The change brings with it some considerable disadvantages.

I know it is claimed in spite of the shortening of the rifle, the result of a certain small change in the grooving, and of one or two other small alterations, has been that you maintain the same muzzle velocity for about 2,000 foot seconds as in the present long rifle, but I am assured by a distinguished member of the Explosives Committee that if the same improvements had been applied to the longer barrel you would have produced a much greater muzzle velocity, probably about 2,400 foot seconds, involving a lower trajectory and a longer range, and so have secured a weapon which would shoot further and be easier for a soldier to shoot with. Therefore, I think that from the point of view of efficiency there is a good deal to be said against the shortening of the barrel for the purpose of any slight reduction in weight. Then I come to the question as to its convenience to mounted men. Undoubtedly, in the old days, when the mounted man's weapon was carried in a bucket on the saddle, it was important that it should be short, but I doubt very much whether with the present fashion of mounted men carrying their rifle as the lance is carried in a clive, with a strap fastened near the muzzle passing around the soldier's arm, the shortening of the rifle greatly adds to its convenience, while it certainly reduces the efficiency of the weapon. Admitting that there is an advantage to mounted men in having a shortened rifle, is it desirable to shorten the rifle for all troops? Why should an infantryman be forced to have a shortened weapon, which certainly will not carry so far, simply for the convenience of the mounted man, especially as the same cartridge would be used if the rifle barrel were made in two lengths? My Lords, a rifle will always out-range a carbine, and it is now proposed to arm all services with a carbine—a greatly improved one no doubt—but still a carbine.

I now come to the question of sights. I have said that the back-sight is a great improvement, and I should say it is as good as any to be found on any foreign rifle, and probably better; but the effect of the shortening of the barrel of the rifle has been to bring the back-sight and the fore-sight much closer together. Instead of being about twenty-four inches apart, they are on the new rifle only nineteen inches apart. Everybody who knows anything about long-range rifle-shooting knows that the longer the distance between the back-sight and the fore-sight the greater you reduce the probability of variation, and the easier you make it to shoot. Provided you get a back-sight sufficiently far from the eye to secure clearness, then the longer the distance between the back-sight and the fore-sight the easier it is to shoot; and what I think we want to arm the British soldier with is not only the best rifle, but the easiest rifle to shoot with. I do think that is a strong objection to the shortened rifle. A single word now on a comparatively small detail with regard to the fore-sight. The fore-sight on the new rifle is protected by a sort of crescent-shaped projection, intended, of course, to protect it from damage—a useful thing for mounted men, but not in anything like the same degree necessary for infantry; and it did strike me in using the rifle that in a bad light this projection would throw such a shadow on the fore-sight itself as would interfere with the clearness of the sight.

I pass next to the bolt action. Here I do really think that we have a cause for grievance against the authorities. I believe that practically every competent gunmaker will tell you that of all the breech actions applied to bolt rifles throughout the world the British one is the weakest. It is true that in the British rifle the strain on the bolt action is less than in most of the other rifles. The strain of explosion on the bolt of the British rifle is, I think, about 16·5 tons, whereas the average strain in the rifles of foreign nations runs to something over nineteen tons, and in one rifle, the Mannlicher, used by Roumania it is as high as twenty-six tons. I am quite sure that any competent gunmaker would tell you that you could not with safety greatly increase the strain that is at present thrown on the British bolt. That is the foundation of one of my chief complaints against this rifle. As you were re-arming the British Forces opportunity should have been taken of strengthening the bolt, so that, in view of any future development of the barrel and the ammunition, you would have a stronger action behind the barrel. The bolt of the British rifle, to begin with, is in two pieces, the bolthead being attached to the bolt by a screw about half an inch in length, and some small portion of the force of the explosion must each time come on the thread of the screw. Necessarily a bolt that is in two pieces is not as strong as a bolt made in one piece, and the thread of the screw becomes worn, not only by the force of the explosion, but also by the strain thrown on it by the extraction of exploded cartridges, the whole of which falls on the thread of the screw. This form of bolt was adopted in British rifles because the authorities thought it was not a good thing for the extractor to pass round a portion of the rim of the cartridge before the process of extraction took place, but this object can equally be effected by placing the extractor on a collar working round the bolt. The result of our plan is that it is made impossible to lock the bolt at the point where the greatest strain takes place—namely, at the base of the barrel.

In the case of the foreign bolts such as the Mauser or Mannlicher two strong lugs are found at the head of the bolt which lock firmly into the action at the very base of the barrel where the main force of the explosion takes place, and there is also at the back of the bolt a further lug to fall back upon. In our rifles the whole of the force of the explosion is taken on the bolt rib and bolt lug towards the base of the bolt, against the rear wall of the recess in the body, at the very point where the action is weakest, because in front it has necessarily to be cut away in order to allow the cartridges to be fed up through it from the magazine below. I think it will be seen that the fact of the bolt locking behind the very weakest part of the whole action does not tend to the strength of the action, but, on the contrary, forms a very marked weakness in it. I should like to give your Lordships my own experience with regard to the solidity of the Mauser action. I have used Mauser rifles now for twelve years. About three years ago I thought I would like to have rather a more powerful weapon, so I determined to fit on to my ·303 action a ·360 barrel. I put the ·360 barrel on to the action that had before served for the ·303 barrel, and by using a straight cartridge I was able to get the ·360 cartridge in the ·303 magazine. With the ·360 barrel I used forty grains of cordite and a bullet weighing 300 grains, as against, in the ·303 barrel, a charge of thirty grains of cordite and a bullet weighing 215 grains. Noble Lords will readily recognise the difference in the strain on the action caused by the use of a barrel with a bigger bore, a heavier bullet, and a larger charge of cordite in comparison with that for which the action was originally intended. That rifle I have used for the last three years; it does not show the least signs of shaking and has been thoroughly satisfactory. Again, I say that if you apply to any competent gunmaker, he would demur to putting a ·360 barrel with that charge on to your British bolt action.

Now I come to the magazine. The magazine of the British rifle is of the old type. It has only changed in this respect, that now it is loaded from a charger, five cartridges being inserted at one motion. You still have this bulky and rather flimsy box under the rifle, just in front of the trigger guard, so that a man shouldering his rifle cannot shoulder it straight. A dent in this box renders the magazine useless, because directly you get any indentation the platform on which the cartridges rest, and from which they are fed into the barrel, refuses to work. On foot and still more on horseback this magazine is liable to be damaged, and is undoubtedly a source of trouble. In the Mauser rifle the magazine is carried completely inside the forehand of the rifle. There is no projection below the rifle in front of the trigger guard. It may be said that the Mauser magazine will only hold five cartridges, while the British magazine holds ten. There might be something in that objection when the magazine was considered only to be a reserve shut off by the cut off, and the rifle was to be used as a single loader till the "supreme moment" arrived. But now that you load from a charger and are to fire always from the magazine, it would be better to adopt the five-shot magazine. You cannot put ten cartridges into one charger, and the result is that it takes three motions in order to fill your ten-shot magazine. My contention is that now that you have adopted the new system of loading from a charger you would do perfectly well with the smaller magazine, and could be able to keep up as rapid a fire from it as from the larger one. Moreover, the advantage of having the magazine enclosed in the stock of the rifle and of not having this protruding box under the rifle is very great. These are two points I wish to press very strongly on the authorities—the desirability of an entire reconsideration of the bolt action and of the magazine. I understand that it has been decided to retain the stock in two pieces. All foreign countries have the woodwork of their rifle in one piece. It is cheaper, and, I believe, stronger. The screw which holds the two pieces of the stock together is apt to work loose through the shock of firing, and no one who has not the experience of it would believe what an effect such a loosening of the screw has on the shooting of the rifle. I believe that there again the foreign system would prove the best.

I have ventured to criticise, but it will perhaps be said to me, What have you got to propose? Well, my contention is this, that it would be a wise thing now for the War Office to hold their hands with regard to the issuing of this rifle. As I understand, they have completed arrangements for its manufacture at the Government factories, but they have not yet entered into complete arrangements with private firms. I quite conceive that a strong argument may be made in favour of giving this shortened rifle to mounted troops, and my suggestion is that His Majesty's Government in the meantime should confine themselves to issuing the new pattern of rifle to the mounted troops. With regard to the other forces, I would suggest that the War Office should apply to the existing rifles the new back-sight and should modify the breach action, by removing the dust cover and adapting it for the use of the charger, which could be effected at little trouble and cost. With these changes you would get two of the greatest improvements in the new rifle incorporated, as I believe, cheaply in the existing rifle. Then I say, go thoroughly and fully into these questions, with the advice of all the best trade experts you can get. I think you will find that professional opinion is pretty unanimous that a great improvement could be effected both in the bolt action and in the magazine. I am sure that the British Army would in no way suffer in the meantime because, even if war were to break out, they would have the new back-sight and the new arrangement for charger loading applied to the magazine.

A single word as to the price of the rifle. I was astonished when I read the other day in the reports of the proceedings in another place that the new rifle was to cost in Government factories £3 10s., and that private firms who were to manufacture it were to get £4 10s. per rifle. That is an enormous price. To give £4 10s. for one of these rifles seems to me most extravagant. The old Martini-Henri rifle cost about £2 2s.; the cost of the French rifle is about £2 or less; and the cost of the Mannlicher and the Mauser is somewhere about £3. I had the curiosity the other day to ask at what price Messrs. Mauser would provide a rifle of their latest pattern adapted to British cartridges. The firm replied that they would be very glad to supply such rifles to the amount of an order of 50,000 at £2 16s. each, or in smaller quantities at £2 18s. If a firm in Germany can supply rifles, about the excellence of which there is no question, at this price, surely it is extravagant for the War Office to give private firms in England £4 10s. per rifle, especially when you consider that this is no new weapon, but a mere modifcation of the existing one. Lastly, I would refer to the great multiplication of parts in the new rifle. It has about 120 parts, which, I think, is an unnecessarily large number. In the Mauser rifle the parts run to about eighty. This, too, is a matter worthy of consideration. I now beg to ask the Question standing in my name.

*EARL STANHOPE: My Lords, before my noble friend the Under-Secretary of State for War answers the interesting enquiry which has been addressed to him by the noble Lord opposite, I wish to put two further questions. No one has more expert knowledge of rifle-shooting than the noble Lord, and it will be readily admitted that no one is more entitled to give his opinion than he is, for it was through his interposition years ago that the Martini-Henri Mark 2 rifle was adopted by the Government. Last year I was informed on good authority that the conversion of the existing rifle would cost £3 10s. That seems to me a very large sum, especially when we are now informed that the new rifle is to be supplied at £4 10s. I should like to know whether the existing rifles cannot be converted at less cost than £3 10s., and whether the existing cartridges can be adapted to the clip system. There is this advantage, I am told, in connection with the new rifle, that it is the only one in the world that can fire eleven shots—that is, one in the barrel and ten (two clips of five) in the magazine. I am bound to say, having handled the rifle, that it is not a beautiful weapon. It is very thick, and looks as if it had a very severe attack of gout. I should be glad if the noble Earl could answer the two questions I have put, and state whether it is intended to convert any of the present rifles.

*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (The Earl of DONOUGHMORE): My Lords, I am glad to be able to inform the noble Earl who has just sat down that the estimate for conversion which he has mentioned is somewhat high. We can convert the rifles in the Ordnance Factories for £2 5s., and I have some hope that later on there may be a reduction upon that price. As to the question whether existing cartridges can be used my reply is in the affirmative. One of the great advantages we claim for this rifle is that we shall use exactly the same cartridges for all branches of the services. I now come to the points raised by Lord Tweedmouth. Nobody can object to criticism from my noble friend on a subject in which his skill and knowledge are well known. I would remind him that the final decision with regard to this rifle was not come to hurriedly. We have been concerned in considering improvements upon the long rifle for many years; in fact, the labours of the Small Arms Committee, whose recommendations have now been adopted, have been going on since 1888. A thousand of the new rifles have already been made and distributed for use in various parts of the world. Some were given to the Navy, some were sent to South Africa, and some to Somaliland, and we have received exhaustive reports upon them. Not to trouble the House with many quotations, I will mention two. One officer commanding a regiment in Somaliland, where, owing to the sand and dust, the test to which the rifles were subjected was a very severe one, reports—

> "The rifles have been used regularly by the men on escort duty marching through sand at least for ten hours at a stretch. They have stood this test very well. The men like the rifle and shoot well with it."

Another commanding officer, also in Somaliland, writes—

> "Only two rifles have been tested as regards firing, and these at small ranges proved satisfactory."

The noble Lord suggested that in securing lightness we had sacrificed accuracy.

LORD TWEEDMOUTH: I beg the noble Earl's pardon. I admit that you have got the same energy as in the old rifle, only if you had retained the length of the old rifle you would have got increased energy. I do not dispute the accuracy of the rifle, but I say you have made it more difficult to shoot with it by bringing the two sights closer together.

*THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: I claim that the new rifle will shoot straighter. It is, I admit, a very close thing, but we find that the shooting with the new rifle is a shade more accurate. Perhaps I may be allowed to quote the figures of merit to your Lordships. Taking the mean of twelve rifles, at 500 yards the long rifle beat the short rifle by ·05 of a foot; at 600 yards the short beat the long by ·09 of a foot; at 1,000 yards the long beat the short by ·17 of a foot; at 1,500 the short beat the long by ·68 of a foot, and at 1,700 by ·09 of a foot. On the whole, therefore, your Lordships will find that, as judged by the tests to which we have been able to submit this rifle for accuracy, we have got a better rifle as the result of the shortening. My noble friend said he did not believe a rifle would be very much good after 8,000 shots had been fired out of it. Well, our friends at Hythe claim that they fired 10,000 shots out of a rifle at 600 yards, and that it was very little the worse. My noble friend mentioned the fact that the new rifle will be handier for the cavalry, but we claim that it will be a very great advantage to have the same rifle for all parts of the service, cavalry, infantry, artillery, sailors, and Marines. When a man breaks his rifle or loses it in the field, it will manifestly be an advantage to have one stock of rifles from which to replenish it. My military colleagues at the War Office believe that one rifle for the whole of the service will be valuable in any war in which we might be engaged. The next point raised by my noble friend was with regard to sights. He admits that we have got a better sight, but does not like the sights being closer together. I confess I am not able to enter into a discussion of theory advanced by my noble friend, I can only rely on the exhaustive tests to which the rifle has been subjected by the Small Arms Committee and at Hythe, and the experience of the use of the new rifle in five campaigns. The result has been that they have shot better although the sights are closer.

LORD TWEEDMOUTH: You have a very much better back-sight, which more than makes up for the difference caused by having the sights closer together.

*THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: The new rifle will kill more men, at any rate, and that is its chief value. As regards the noble Lord's criticism of the bolt action, I can only remind your Lordships that practically the same bolt action has been used in five campaigns, and we have had absolutely no complaints about it. It is strong enough to permit of a further velocity of 200 feet or 300 feet. As to the magazine, which my noble friend described as flimsy, I admit that if you hit it hard with your fist you might be able to crumple it up, but we have used that magazine in five campaigns and have not had a single one sent back for repairs. I think that is a testimony that the magazine is a good one. Again, it is easier to clean, and it is an important thing on active service to be able to clean the magazine quickly, and so preserve its life. My noble friend suggested that we should hold our hand. I am afraid I cannot hold out any very strong hope that we shall do that, but what the noble Lord has said will be most earnestly considered by my colleagues at the War Office. We believe we have got a rifle which is a considerable improvement on the old one, and considerably better as regards figure of merit than the rifles of four foreign nations with which we have carried out extensive experiments at the same time. We are perfectly alive to the importance of the matter, and I can assure my noble friend that if any improvements can be made, even at the last moment, they will be adopted. My noble friend asks whether gauges and specifications have yet been sent out to private firms for the manufacture of the new service rifle. The answer is in the affirmative. He next asks what is the explanation of the high price which it has been announced such firms are to receive. My noble friend considers £4 10s. excessive. I would point out that the price of a rifle is always far higher when you begin to make it, than after you have been making it for some years, and the reason is perfectly obvious. You have got to make the price pay for the tools, and in the course of manufacture you are very often able to make improvements which cheapen the price. The long rifle when it was originally made cost in the Ordnance Factories £4 15s., and in the trade £5 10s. But the price of exactly the same rifle in 1903 was £2 11s. 6d. in the Ordnance Factories and £3 10s. in the trade. We are starting this rifle at £4 10s., which is a considerable improvement on the price at which we started the old rifle, and I confidently hope that, as time goes on, and the machinery charges are paid off, we shall be able to considerably improve on that price. The noble Lord asks whether it has been decided to issue the weapon in its present form to all branches of the defence services. The answer is in the affirmative. As to the other question which the noble Lord has put to me, namely, how long a time will elapse before the re-armament of His Majesty's forces will be complete, that I am afraid depends upon the Estimates submitted in another place in future years. I cannot give any pledge as to how much money the other House will be willing to provide for this purpose. We have arranged to distribute 95,000 of these rifles this year, between the Navy, India, and the Colonies, and we hope in addition to have another 122,000 completed this year, making a total of nearly 220,000 to be ready for use before the 1st April, 1905.

*THE EARL OF ERROLL: My Lords, I rise to offer a few observations on this subject. There has been a good deal of criticism upon this new rifle, but I do not think we ought to attach too much importance to it, because whenever a new rifle is issued to the troops we invariably have a certain amount of adverse criticism, and the rifle is nearly always unfavourably compared with the one which it supersedes. I remember only too well that when the Lee-Metford rifle was brought in, there was nothing bad enough that could be said of it, and it was very unfavourably compared with the Martini-Henry. We know that this new service rifle has gone satisfactorily through five campaigns. It is not a new rifle, but a modification of the old rifle, and it is the outcome of the South African War. At the beginning of that war the cavalry were armed with carbines, and it was found that the Boer rifle so far outranged the carbine that the cavalry, when fighting on foot, were placed at very great disadvantage. The result was that the cavalry had to be re-armed throughout with the long rifle—not a very desirable thing when one is on service. Towards the end of the war it was decided that a shorter rifle would be a good thing, and I must say that, so far as the cavalry are concerned, it is most important that they should have this rifle. Future wars will not always be carried on under similar conditions to the South African War, where the enemy had no cavalry and there was little ground suitable for cavalry tactics. With the long rifle it would be impossible during a war for the men to use their swords or lances. The new rifle is of the greatest importance to the cavalry, and I think that the shortening and consequently the lightening of this arm is of very great importance also to the infantry. Your Lordships will recognise that at the end of a long march a man who has carried a rifle weighing one pound four ounces lighter will be much less fatigued than his comrade who has carried a heavier rifle. In future wars we shall use more mounted infantry than hitherto, and the old rifle was very clumsy for them to handle. The desire of the Small Arms Committee was to secure a shorter and lighter weapon if that could be done without interfering with efficiency, and I think the Committee have succeeded in that. I have seen reports from Somaliland extremely favourable to this rifle. The noble Earl, Lord Stanhope, said the rifle was not a pretty one. It is, perhaps, a little clumsy to look at, but we cannot always go in for beauty, and after all, it is a serviceable, workmanlike, and good weapon. As to the cavalry, I think the best way of carrying the rifle is in the bucket, in the same way as the old carbine was carried. The answer to the noble Lord's criticism with regard to the bolt is that it has stood the test of several campaigns with satisfaction, and that we do not wish to put any further pressure upon it. for if we did the kick would be so great that a man would not be able to shoot with it.

THE ROLL OF PEERS.

*THE EARL OF BELMORE: My Lords, I rise to ask His Majesty's Government whether there would be any objection to there being laid on the Table of this House, at the beginning of each session of Parliament, a list of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal arranged in the order in which they first sat in Parliament, with the dates. This is not a very important matter, but at the same time it is one that excites a little curiosity outside this House. We see from time to time statements in the newspapers as to who is Father of the House, and who are the senior sitting Members, and naturally inaccuracies creep in because the persons who write these paragraphs forget that it does not follow that a noble Lord has taken his seat immediately after either he has succeeded to his title or come of age. I do not think that to make a list of this sort would be a very difficult matter. Some twenty years ago there was in the library a manuscript list of the sort I allude to, and if that list is not in existence I think it would be possible to make a new one.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (The Marquess of LANSDOWNE): My Lords, I awaited with some curiosity the statement of the reasons for which the noble Earl has made this inquiry. I am advised that it would be possible to compile a list of the kind he suggests, but that it would take a certain amount of trouble. I understand that the noble Earl desires this list in order to set at rest any doubts which may exist in the minds of your Lordships or outside this House as to the seniority of certain Peers, and particularly with regard to the seniority of the particular Peer who has the good or ill fortune to be the Father of your Lordships' House. I cannot help thinking that some means might be found of establishing the point of seniority as between that particular Peer and his competitors simpler than that of compiling a list of the whole of the Members of your Lordships' House, with the dates at which they took their seats. Perhaps the noble Earl will allow me, having heard what he has said, to confer with the officers of the House and see whether we cannot hit upon some simpler expedient for giving him the information he desires.

*THE EARL OF BELMORE: I am glad to hear the answer which the noble Marquess has given, and to concur in his suggestion.

SUPPLY OF ELECTRICITY BILL [H.L.]

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

LORD WOLVERTON: My Lords, this is a useful but a highly technical Bill, and one which has been framed by the Board of Trade to carry into effect the recommendations of a Select Committee appointed in 1898. The Committee was presided over by my noble friend Lord Cross, and among other members of the Committee was the noble Earl the Leader of the Opposition. The first six sections carry out the recommendations contained in the Report of that Committee. The provision as to the compulsory acquisition of land for generating stations was very strongly urged by the Joint Committee of the two Houses. It will be noticed that one of the sections removes the existing veto of local authorities, but preserves their right to be heard. With the exceptions of the provisions I have mentioned the clauses are all of an administrative character, and as the Bill will be referred to a Select Committee of your Lordships' House I do not think I need on this occasion say more in moving the Second Reading.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Wolverton.*)

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and referred to a Select Committee.

THE LATE LORD SALISBURY.

THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My Lords, I beg to give notice that on Tuesday next I shall move:—"That an humble address be presented to His Majesty, praying that His Majesty will give directions that a monument be erected in the collegiate church of St. Peter's, Westminster, to the memory of the late Right Hon. the Marquess of Salisbury, with an inscription expressive of the high sense of the House of his rare and splendid gifts and of his devoted labours in Parliament and in great offices of State."

House adjourned at twenty minutes before Six o'clock to Monday next, a quarter before Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 13th May, 1904.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS (NO STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE).

MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, referred on the First Reading thereof, no Standing Orders are applicable, viz.:—Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill; Education Board Provisional Orders (Cardiff and Newport (Monmouthshire) Bill.

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time upon Monday next.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH).

MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz.:—Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill.

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time upon Monday next.

Brymbo Water Bill; Cambrian Railways Bill [Lords]; London and India Docks Company Bill. As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill. Read the third time, and passed.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill; Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (Gas) Bill. Read a second time, and committed.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 7). Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade, under the Electric Lighting Acts, 1882 and 1888, The Electric Lighting (Scotland) Act, 1890, and The Electric Lighting (Scotland) Act, 1902, relating to Barrhead, Bothwell, Eastwood and Cathcart, Johnstone, Kilpatrick, Lanark, Renfrew, and Shettlestone, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Bonar Law and Mr. Gerald Balfour.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill. "To confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade, under the Electric Lighting Acts, 1882 and 1888, The Electric Lighting (Scotland) Act, 1890, and The Electric Lighting (Scotland) Act, 1902, relating to Barrhead, Bothwell, Eastwood and Cathcart, Johnstone, Kilpatrick, Lanark, Renfrew, and Shettlestone," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 195.]

Radcliffe Tramways and Improvement Bill. Reported, with Amendments, from the Police and Sanitary Committee [Section A]; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Lytham Improvement Bill. Reported, with Amendments, from the Police and Sanitary Committee [Section B]; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—Ryde Gas Bill, with an Amendment.

Amendments to—Ipswich Dock Commission Bill [Lords]; Huddersfield Corporation Act, 1902 (Amendment) Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confer further powers upon the Leicestershire and Warwickshire Electric Power Company; and for other purposes." [Leicestershire and Warwickshire Electric Power Bill [Lords.]

And, also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confer further powers upon the Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Electric Power Company; and for other purposes." [Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Electric Power Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to empower the Corporation of Great Yarmouth to construct tramways, street improvements, and other works, and to acquire the ferries across the Haven, to make further provision in regard to the health, local government, and improvement of the said borough; and for other purposes." [Great Yarmouth Corporation Bill [Lords.]

And, also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act for empowering the Cardiff Railway Company to construct a new railway, and to abandon the construction of a portion of railway already authorised, and for amending the Acts relating to the Cardiff Railway Company; and for other purposes." [Cardiff Railway Bill [Lords.]

Leicestershire and Warwickshire Electric Power Bill [Lords]; Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Electric Power Bill [Lords]; Great Yarmouth Corporation Bill [Lords]; Cardiff Railway Bill [Lords]. Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Two Petitions from Perth, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

HIGHWAYS BILL.

Petition from Darton, against; to lie upon the Table.

HOUSE-LETTING (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Dundee, against; to lie upon the Table.

LICENCES (RENEWAL).

Petitions against alteration of Law; from Blyth Bridge; Kingsland Penarth; Dinas; Pentonville; Islington; Williamstown (four); Brixton; Norfolk; East Cornwall; Cleveland and North Yorkshire; Shaftesbury; Great Grimsby; Liverpool; Coventry; Great Yarmouth; Arundel; Darlington (three); Llandrindod Wells; Holbeck; Upper Stratton; Lydiard Millicent; Swindon (three); Chiseldon; Wroughton; Perth; Shipley; Central Yorkshire; Ware; Maida Vale; Gateshead; Durham; Sudbury; Wroxall; St. Catherine's; Manchester (two); Monkwearmouth; Bracknell; Humberstone; Rochdale; Gloucester (two); and Cowen; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions against; from Lennahglow; Glasgow (ten); Chelmsford; Hackney; Kircudbright; Barry Dock thirteen); Gilfach Goch (two); Porth (two); Whitehaven; Tinyrefail; Llanharon; Porthcawl; Bridgend; Cardiff; Dundee (three); Renfrew; Cleave; Wimbledon; Blairgowrie; Blandford; Blackmoore; Darlington; Liverpool; Preston; Downton; Usk; Kilwinning; Droitwich; South and West Salford; Hanwell; Stockton on Tees; Edinburgh (seven); Bradford (two); Aberdeen (two); Pollokshaws; West Ham (two); Greenock (four); Foulsham; Stoke Newington; Bryn;

Eccleshill; Attercliffe; Royston; Birmingham; Ampthill; Hamilton; Bainsford; Merthyr; Oxford (two); St. Clement's; Brotton; Leominster; Newcastle on Tyne; Batley; Totnes; Dittisham; Marylebone; Edgware Road; Halifax; Dumbartonshire; Pembroke; Brixton; Middlesbrough; Penygraig; Calderhead; Yorkshire; Handsworth; Villa Road; Gateshead; Islington (two); Sheffield; Southampton; Dumbarton; Lochee; Inverness; Ayrshire (two); Larkhall; Brixham; Macclesfield; Sons of Temperance Friendly Society; Sanquhar; Tallentire; Red Lake; Kilbarchan; Torquay; Monkwearmouth; Sunderland; Kingston; Perth; Hull; Long Clawson; Leicester; Folkestone; Llanstephan; Cowes; Leith (two); Granton; Hastings; and Merioneth; to be laid upon the Table.

PUBLIC LIBRARIES BILL.

Petition from Darton, against; to lie upon the Table.

ROMAN CATHOLIC DISABILITIES REMOVAL BILL.

Petition from Edinburgh, against; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRANSVAAL.

Copy presented, of Further Correspondence relating to the Transvaal Labour Importation Ordinance [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Naval Pensions.

SIR CARNE RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the Department will take into consideration the possibility of granting (as in the Army) pensions to men of sixty-five years of age, who have done campaign service, are in receipt of a medal, and who have served in the Royal Navy or Marines.

(*Answered by Mr. Pretyman.*) The same necessity does not arise in the Navy as in the Army, as the cases referred to are dealt with by the grant of Greenwich Hospital special pensions up to 1s. 3d. a day.

Wild Birds Protection Act—Clearer Notices.

MR. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.): To ask the Secretary for Scotland whether, in the publication of the notices under the Wild Birds Protection Acts, he can arrange to give a short excerpt from the sections of the Acts referred to in the order, so that the notice should be intelligible to the readers without having to refer to the terms of the Act.

(*Answered by Mr. A. Graham Murray.*) I should be glad if the proposal of the hon. Member were generally adopted, but the matter is one for the county councils' determination, who are the responsible authorities.

Postmastership of Kilrush—Applications from Members of Irish Postal Service.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): To ask the Postmaster-General how many applications were received from members of the Irish postal service for the postmastership of Kilrush, county Clare, and what was the length of service of each applicant; what is the length of service of the sorting clerk and telegraphist from Retford appointed to the position; what special qualifications did he possess over the Irish applicants; and what knowledge does he possess of the needs of the locality in which he has been appointed postmaster.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) Thirty applications were received from officers employed in the postal service in Ireland for the postmastership of Kilrush. The length of established service of the recommended Irish candidates ranged from four and a quarter to sixteen and a half years. The length of the established service of the sorting clerk and telegraphist appointed to the postmastership was seventeen and a half years. I accept, of course, full responsibility for the appointments which I make, but I deprecate any attempt to discuss the relative merits of different candidates by way of Question and Answer in this House.

Bideford, Westward Ho, and Appledore Railway—Loop on the Quay Road, Bideford.

MR. SOARES (Devonshire, Barnstaple): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that by The Bideford, Westward Ho, and Appledore Railway Act, 1896, the promoters of the railway were empowered to lay a single line of rails along the Quay Road, Bideford, but were forbidden to make a loop or passing place on the Quay Road without the consent of the Corporation; that on the faith of this and other sections being inserted for their protection the Corporation and the inhabitants generally did not oppose the Bill; that notwithstanding a subsequent refusal of their consent by the Corporation the company laid the loop; that an action in the High Court was successfully brought by the Corporation; that the railway company then applied to the Light Railway Commissioners for power to lay the loop, who decided to grant the application, and that the Board of Trade have notified their intention of confirming the sanction; and, if so, whether, in view of the circumstances of the case, he will take steps to revoke the confirmation by the Board of Trade of this order.

(*Answered by Mr. Gerald Balfour.*) The matters referred to were argued before the Light Railway Commissioners who held a local inquiry, and again at the Board of Trade on appeal from the Commissioners. The Board were advised by their inspecting officers that the loops ought to be authorised for the safety and convenience of the road and rail traffic, and the Department decided accordingly to uphold the decision of the Light Railway Commissioners.

Naval Expenditure of France, Germany, and Russia.

MR. RUNCIMAN (Dewsbury): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he can state what has been the total naval expenditure out of revenue or out of capital, apart from special war expenditure, of France, Germany, and Russia respectively for each year for the past twenty-five years.

(*Answered by Mr. Pretyman.*) There are no data at the Admiralty which would enable me to give the information desired by the hon. Member.

Somaliland—Cost of Military Operations prior to 1st October, 1902.

MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer what was the total cost of military operations in Somaliland prior to the 1st October, 1902.

(*Answered by Earl Percy.*) It is impossible to give the figures asked for by the hon. Member without a careful examination of the accounts, and I shall be obliged if the hon. Member will kindly postpone his Question for a few days.

Imperial Defence Act—Expenditure for Military Purposes.

MR. RUNCIMAN: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether any portion of the money raised under the Imperial Defence Act was spent on military, as distinguished from naval, purposes; and, if so, what was the amount so expended in each year from 1888 to 1896.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) The military expenditure on fortifications, barracks, works, and heavy ordnance, under the Imperial Defence Loan for the years 1888–9 to 1895–6, was as follows:—1888–89, £234,264; 1889–90, £594,067; 1890–91, £794,281; 1891–92, £479,115; 1892–93, £262,364; 1893–94, £99,485; 1894–95, £67,941; 1895–96, £64,847; Total £2,596,364.

Tibetan Mission.

MR. LAMBERT: To ask the Secretary of State for India what has been the cost already incurred by the Tibetan Mission; what is the estimated cost of the advance to Lhasa; and what number of troops is proposed to be employed.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) I am awaiting from India a statement of the cost already incurred and estimates of the future expenditure. The reinforcements proposed by the Government of India, with a view to the possible advance to Lhasa, consist of four companies British Infantry, four companies

Native Infantry, two 10-pounders Royal Artillery, two seven-pounder mule guns, and one mule corps.

Inspection of the River Barrow.

Mr. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether any intimation has been forwarded to the Board of Works from the Department of Agriculture, requesting that an inspection should be made of the River Barrow by a qualified expert; and, if so, what steps have been taken in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) An intimation to this effect was communicated to the Board of Public Works on behalf not of the Department but of the Council of Agriculture. The Council was of opinion that such an inspection would serve as a useful preliminary to further action, involving liberal aid from public funds, without which no proper remedy could be provided. It has already been pointed out that the cost of undertaking the drainage of the Barrow would very largely exceed the estimate (£354,000) framed by the Royal Commission in 1887. There is no prospect of obtaining funds upon such a scale for this purpose, and consequently no useful object would be gained by having an inspection made as suggested.

New Bridge at Waterford—Government and Local Contributions.

Mr. WILLIAM MOORE (Antrim, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if the Government have placed or promised £50,000 towards a new bridge at Waterford; what are the contributions towards the cost of such bridge from the borough of Waterford, the county of Waterford, and the two adjoining counties; and at what figure is the total cost estimated.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) Sir, no such grant or promise has been made.

Irish Agricultural Department—Distribution of Funds.

Mr. WILLIAM MOORE: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will consider the practicability in the Annual Report of the Agricultural Department (Ireland) of showing Province by Province, and county by county, the participation of each in the moneys dispensed by the Department in the execution of its objects, and the amount of contribution raised in each.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) The Department will consider how far it may be practicable to give this information in its Annual Reports.

1st V.B. Royal Fusiliers (Cadet Battalion)—Court of Inquiry.

Sir CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state if a Court of inquiry in which evidence was ordered to be taken on oath was held last year in the cadet battalion attached to the 1st Volunteer Battalion Royal Fusiliers; and, if so, who it was who ordered evidence to be taken on oath.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) A Court of inquiry, at which evidence was taken on oath, was held in this cadet battalion in August 1903. The instructions for the procedure of this Court were issued by the General Officer Commanding the Home District. I regret that in the investigations made in reply to my hon. friend's Question on the 3rd instant this case was overlooked.

Salaries and Commission of Crown Agents.

Mr. SCOTT MONTAGU (Hampshire, New Forest): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he will state what are the salaries paid respectively to the Crown Agents, and what is done with any surplus out of the commission after paying salaries and office expenses; and what are the scales of commission charges for services in raising loans, and for services in connection with sending out material such as rails or railway materials.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*) The salaries at present paid to the three Crown Agents are £2,300, £1,450, and £1,200 respectively; any surplus arising out of the receipts from commissions, etc., is carried to a reserve fund, the income of which is applicable to meeting the charges for the pensions of themselves and their staff and the deficits which in some years occur in their office fund accounts. The hon. Member will find full particulars as to the authorised scales of commission for different services in the enclosure to the circular despatch which I have recently addressed to the Colonial Governments who employ them, and which has been laid before Parliament in Cd. 1944.

MERCHANT SHIPPING (LIGHTHOUSES) BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order for Second Reading read.

*MR. PLUMMER (Newcastle-on-Tyne), in moving the Second Reading of the Merchant Shipping (Lighthouses) Bill, said that this was a measure of great importance, not only to shipowners but to all shipping centres and to the country generally. In a country so dependent as we were upon our mercantile marine, anything that benefited it directly or indirectly in the long run benefited the community generally. He moved the Second Reading of the Bill which last year was in the able hands of the hon. Member for the Exchange Division of Liverpool, and which was only defeated then by eleven votes. This year they hoped it would obtain a larger measure of success. A few words as to the history of our coast lights and light dues might not be deemed out of place. Originally, the lighting of our coasts, so far as it was done at all, was carried out by various religious communities, who performed a duty which would otherwise have been left undone. On the dissolution of these religious bodies, persons engaged in the work as a matter of business under licence from the Crown, and were entitled to charge tolls on passing ships. About three centuries ago the Admiralty lights which then existed were transferred by Royal Charter to Trinity House, and it was stated to be for the benefit of the merchant navy. Coming down to modern times, they found that by a series of Acts between 1850 and 1854 the Board of Trade was charged with the general superintendence of matters relating to the mercantile marine, including the lighthouse service, which was an important factor both as regarded the income and expenditure of the Board of Trade, for taking 1894, the year when the Commission of Inquiry so ably presided over by the Right Hon. Leonard Courtney was appointed out of a gross expenditure of £578,000 the lighthouse service was responsible for £387,000, while out of total receipts of £630,000 the light dues accounted for £542,000.

Whilst the Board of Trade exercised supervision over the whole of the United Kingdom, each part of the United Kingdom had its own Lighthouse Board. In England they had Trinity House, in Scotland a body described as the Commissioners of Northern Lighthouses, and in Ireland they had the Irish Lights Commission. It would be well to note the constitution of these three different authorities. Trinity House, of course, was an ancient and honourable corporation, and he was sure anything that was said in the course of the debate would not reflect in any way either upon the antiquity or respectability of that body. They all respected Trinity House as Trinity House, and if it were criticised it would only be as a modern lighting authority. There were a certain number of Elder and Junior Brethren. Of the Elder Brethren many of them might be described, without any reflection upon them or the slightest intention to give offence, as honorary and ornamental. They were gentlemen of high social position who had done great service to the State, and he believed the position was considered a compliment to anyone receiving the appointment. Of the other brethren, the hon. Member for the Exchange Division of Liverpool last year pointed out that nearly half of them had already passed the allotted span of three score years and ten, and could not, therefore, be considered to be up to date in mercantile experience. They belonged to the sailing age rather than the steam age; and certainly did not belong to what was now known as the turbine age. The Commissioners of Northern Lighthouses made no pretence to expert knowledge and experience; none of them were specially qualified for the position they held, and he hoped he would not be considered at all irreverent if he described the Board as a sort of

Scotch broth of law officers, provosts, bailies, and sheriffs. Although they were excellent and worthy men in their civic and legal capacity, none of them were specially qualified for the position which they held on the Northern Lights Commission. Not being an Irishman, he could not describe the Irish Board as a species of Scotch broth, but it might be described as an Irish stew of lord mayors, aldermen, and sheriffs, and certain co-opted members, all of them without special mercantile or nautical experience.

The object of the Bill was to amend the law with regard to lighthouses, to abolish light dues, to provide for the efficient management of the lighthouse service, and to transfer from the present boards to the Board of Trade itself, the powers of the three lighting authorities. The existing boards were not only not representative but inexperienced in modern mercantile marine, and their history revealed not a little extravagance and great deal of inefficiency—extravagance in raising more money than was required, and inefficiency in spending that money in the wrong direction. Prior to the year 1855, when the Trinity House had sole control of the large sums collected from the mercantile marine, large funds were contributed to charitable purposes at the expense of the mercantile marine. In 1855, by the Merchant Shipping Act, the financial control, as distinct from the administrative control, was transferred to the Board of Trade. This was undoubtedly a step in the right direction; but still between 1384 and 1899 no less than £1,250,000 were raised more than was required, whilst they estimated that the excess collected over requirements up to date amounted to £1,800,000. This could not now be allocated to charity, because this was prevented by the Act of 1855, but it was allocated to other purposes more or less useful, but not akin to the lighthouse service. In 1894 a Royal Commission was appointed and in 1896 it presented a valuable Report, recommending that in future light dues should be devoted to lighting and lighthouse purposes—a proposition so reasonable and so in accord with one's idea of common sense and justice that he wondered it had not been arrived at earlier. One result of this, however, was that the Board of Trade found itself with a far larger income than was required for legitimate purposes, and, consequently, expenditure on lighthouses had gone on at an extravagant rate. Still, the process of collecting more than was required had gone steadily on, and at the present time he estimated that there were surplus funds of something over £400,000.

There was only one other matter which he ought to mention to complete the history of the lighting authorities. In 1900 the Board of Trade appointed what was known as an Advisory Committee. That body consisted of merchants, shipowners, and underwriters, who met in annual conference, presided over by the President of the Board of Trade, accompanied by the permanent heads of the Department. That Committee made an annual Report, which was forwarded to the Board of Trade. That Report seemed to him to be a valuable *résumé* of the past work of the lighting authorities, and nothing more than a fair criticism of the proposed expenditure in the future, and their view of the past expenditure.

Having dealt with the past history of the lighting authorities, might he venture to advance some arguments for a change in the administration of the lighthouse service? First of all, the promoters of this Bill asserted that day, as they did last year, that the question of the lighting of our coasts was a national and even international duty. It was regarded as a national duty by every other nation, with one or two insignificant exceptions, the chief of which was Turkey, and he did not suppose that that was an example which ought to be followed by Great Britain. They asserted in the second place, that the lighthouse service was essential for the safety of His Majesty's Navy, which itself was exempt from the payment of light dues. It was for the benefit and security not only of our own ships but of all the shipping which passed along our coasts. It was not a question of saving property alone, but a life-saving question; and even if our mercantile marine did not exist to-morrow, it would still be our duty to light our coasts in the sacred cause of charity, and for life-saving purposes. It was scarcely necessary for him to enlarge on the national obligation aspect of this question, because the subject had been inquired into by Committees appointed by Parliament, and by Royal Commissions, in 1822, 1834, 1845, 1860, and 1902. All these had with unanimity condemned the existing system, and had practically asked that this should be made a national obligation. The last Royal Commission was not asked to report on this particular point, but it was fair to assume from that that the Government were well satisfied with the previous Reports on that aspect of the question, and did not require further investigation.

He did not hesitate to assert that the change he and his friends wanted was desirable in the national interest. Our mercantile marine had been rightly described as a great national asset, and that point had never been brought more prominently before the nation and the Empire, than during the recent South African War. And, as a great national asset, he maintained that the British mercantile marine ought to be encouraged wherever it was possible, and that everything which hampered it should be removed. The Board of Trade had latterly shown a disposition to encourage and not to hamper the mercantile marine. He was speaking on this question, not from a shipowner's point of view, for he was not a shipowner, but he ventured to say that the relations between the President and officials of the Board of Trade and the shipping community had never been happier than those now existing. They appreciated the spirit which had emanated little acts of encouragement to the shipping community, and that had been shown, in not a small way, by the fully appreciated concession of 12½ per. cent. reduction in the light dues. The difficulty he believed did not rest with the Board of Trade except in so far as it was governed by financial considerations and a healthy fear of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. He would rather describe its attitude as one of benevolent neutrality. The financial consideration was, however, the primary consideration, and was bound to be taken into account. It might be said that the shipowners wanted to make the country pay their light dues; but he would rather put it the other way. The shipowners had for generations been paying for what ought to be a national expenditure and what was unanimously admitted to be a national obligation. They had relieved successive Chancellors of the Exchequer from providing for an expenditure which properly belonged to them. In conclusion, he would point out that this Bill could not in any way affect the present financial year. It could not operate before 1st January next year, and as the existing surplus would provide for next year, there would practically be no charge on the National Exchequer until 1906, when they had a right to assume that the financial position would be better than it was at present. Let the House imagine for a moment that there was no mercantile marine. In that case lights would still have to be provided, if only for the safety of His Majesty's Navy. But if there was no mercantile marine, there would be no British nation. Four-fifths of the amount now expended was expended free from Government control, except that control which occurred after the expenditure by way of Government audit.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central) said that no expenditure was possible without the sanction of the Board of Trade.

*MR. PLUMMER said he accepted the correction of his right hon. friend and would conclude in the words of the Royal Commission, "that the lighting of the coasts was a high Imperial duty which this country owed not merely to itself, but to other countries which traded with it." Although written sixty years ago, these words had lost none of their force but had rather gained in strength by the lapse of time.

*MR. REA (Gloucester) said that the arguments in favour of the Bill were familiar to the House, and after the excellent speech of his hon. friend need not be recapitulated. The opposition to the Bill was founded on no principle whatever. The position of the opposition to the measure was, perfectly candidly and cynically stated last year by the then Chancellor of the Exchequer, who said, "Here is £500,000, and I mean to stick to it." The argument was that they had here a small and wealthy class which had always borne this burden—the maintenance of what was really a branch of the Civil Service—and why should they disturb an arrangement so profitable and comfortable? This defence appeared to be both cynical and immoral, and not economically sound. He maintained that the shipowners, who were really the chief supporters of the Bill, were acting far more in the public interest than in their own, because he believed that the shipowners did not ultimately pay the tax. It was not a tax on ships, but was a tax on British ports. The ultimate incidence of a tax was a very interesting and oftentimes a difficult question. At any rate, the incidence of this tax appeared to be too much for the power of economic analysis of the late Chancellor of the Exchequer. At the beginning of his speech last year the right hon. Gentleman stated that the Bill was an attempt to transfer the cost of lighting the coasts of this country from the shoulders of the shipowners to the shoulders of the taxpayers. Later on he said that the shipowners did not pay light dues any more than they paid dock dues; and at the end of his speech he said that this was an impost which produced £800,000 a year, of which £120,000 was paid by the foreigner. In his own opinion the second dictum of the late Chancellor of the Exchequer was right. He did not believe that it was the shipowner who ultimately paid. This was not a tax on ships but on British ports. The British shipowner was as free as the foreign shipowner to avail of the lights in the Channel without any payment if he sent his ships to Hamburg or Antwerp. It was an irritating impost on foreign trade of the country, import and export, and not on British ships which were year by year becoming more and more employed in foreign ports. There was, however, one portion of light dues which British shipowners had to pay, and they were those of the United States, America charging light dues only to the ships of nations which charged light dues on her ships. American ships coming to Southampton had thus to pay £3,000 or £4,000 light dues, but British ships had to pay £70,000 or £80,000 to the American Exchequer, and this enormous sum did come out of the pockets of the British shipowner. He maintained that this was a mischievous tax upon British ports; and he submitted that even if the nation refrained from expenditure in the improvement of British ports, it should not impose a tax upon them for the purposes of what was really a branch of the Civil Service.

Moreover, they protested against the administration of the lighting authorities, it was wasteful and irresponsible. The, no doubt, excellent men comprising those authorities had no relation to their duties; they had only one obligation, and that was to get rid of the money lest if they had a surplus they should be deprived of a portion of their dues. Last year they had imprudently accumulated a surplus, with the result that they were deprived of 12½ per cent. of their dues. Up to 1897 there was some check on the expenditure of the lighting authorities, because the Treasury kept their eye on them, and were lying in wait for any surplus there might be; but under the Act of 1897, which was introduced as a result of an agitation chiefly in Liverpool, all the dues were applied to the purpose of the lighting of the coasts, with the result that the expenditure was increased. He maintained that the whole system of lighting was bad in practice and indefensible in theory; and that the impost had every economic vice that a tax could have. In the first place, it was imposed by the wrong people. It was a national duty, and ought to be imposed impartially on the whole community. Secondly, it was said it was partially levied, only the mercantile steamers paid, ships of the Royal Navy contributed nothing. Thirdly, it was said that it was administered by the wrong persons absolutely inexperienced and unprofessional; and fourthly that it took more out of the pockets of the payers than was necessary for the service, extravagant though it was. It took £70,000 or £80,000 more than was required for this wasteful administration, and put it into the coffers of a foreign State.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

*SIR ALBERT ROLLIT (Islington, S.) remarked that what had been said as to the position of the shipowners was confirmed by the fact that the Chambers of Commerce of this country almost universally sympathised with the proposals of the Bill. This was a tax which was entirely against the principles of taxation, in so far that it taxed trade and industry, and operated as a tax on both imports and exports, thus materially affecting the trade of this country. Lighting the coasts was a national duty, and in the van of foreign countries who recognised the fact was Japan, from whom we might take example. These dues affected the mercantile community and the trade of this country through the carriage of goods, as well as the shipowners, and also the consumers, who in the end paid at any rate a portion of them. Passengers were also interested, and in this respect and in relation to the saving of life the lighting of our coasts was largely a humanitarian consideration. The commercial interests of the country required this reform. We should make our ports accessible and attractive. When we saw Antwerp taking up the position of the third port in the world, and the way in which Hamburg and Genoa were competing as centres for the distribution of produce in Europe, it should teach us a lesson, not only with regard to the Port of London Bill, but on all occasions to make our ports deep and cheap and safe to the commerce of the world. After all, the question was largely one of the incidence of this tax, and although the Chancellor of the Exchequer might have to make some sacrifice, he was not, after all, asked to transfer the whole burden, for part of it was already borne by the nation as consumers. The hon. Member called attention to the way in which the shipping of this country and of Canada was penalised as a result of the mode in which the light dues were collected from foreign ships, and asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer to think Imperially on this subject, and where possible economically to make reciprocal arrangements with our Colonies. He asserted it was the strong feeling in Canada, to his own knowledge derived there, that the Dominion was suffering this burden because we would not perform our national duty in lighting the coasts. As a parallel he pointed to the fact that on land the antiquated method of the turnpike had been found inconvenient for raising the funds necessary to keep the roads in repair to the market towns, and said that on the sea—the highway of the world—this was a most inconvenient, deterrent way of collecting the dues to light our coasts.

He did not thank the Government for the Bill of 1898. It was not only a failure in some respects but an injustice, and although Liverpool was glad to accept it, at Hull and the north-eastern ports the lighting dues had been, in the case of the Baltic and Mediterranean trades, increased threefold thereby. With regard to the Navy, the ships of the Navy were the ships of the State—of the whole community—and as the whole community got the benefit they should bear some of the taxation, but the shipowners had been greatly penalised by the extravagance displayed in the works at the Admiralty pier and harbour works at Dover. He did not know whether a Government Department had always proved the most effective in dealing with trade and industrial matters, but it was quite clear that in the case of many of these ports the Irish lights, the Scotch lights, and the northern lights, their representative character must be largely increased. With regard to the Trinity House, he would remind the House that it had always shown itself to be up to date and competent to deal with the matters submitted for its consideration. They were most nautical, practical seaman, and as Trinity Masters in the Admiralty Court administered the finest points of seamanship, and we were indebted to them for the great school of Trinity House which had turned out so many who had in the past become captains and admirals of the Fleet. We should not abolish, but if necessary, which he doubted, tryand adapt this establishment. with all its experience and knowledge and corporate character, to the wants of to-day. He could only say that, if they gave the Board of Trade more powers, he could see no reason why they should divorce the present long and able partnership, and a great charity in the form of the Trinity House. He heartily supported the Second Reading of the Bill, and he hoped that in the commercial interest generally it would eventually become the law of the land; but from this he expressly excepted the clauses relating to the Trinity House.

*MR. JOYCE (Limerick) said he did notbelieve from the point of view of the shipowner—he held no brief for that class, but he did think it would be conducive to the best interests of shipping in this country if the lighting of their coasts were made an Imperial charge. He would not go over the stereotyped ground in regard to this matter. Undoubtedly, in all civilised countries the lighting of the coasts was an Imperial charge, and he did not see why this country should be behind the times in this respect. He did not propose either to deal with constitution or the working of Trinity House, or with that of the Northern Lights Commissioners, but he did wish to say a few words in regard to the constitution and working of the Irish Lights Commissioners, with whom he was much more intimately acquainted. He believed that if this charge became an Imperial charge, the coasts of this country would be much better lighted, and in these days of huge vessels and increased trade it was certainly desirable that the coasts should be better lighted even in the interests of life and property. The Irish Lights Commissioners were a body of men who, with the exception of the Lord Mayor and High Sheriff and three members of the Dublin Corporation, co-opted their own members, and there was no authority over them except in regard to expenditure. Time and time again during the past few years Questions had been addressed by hon. Members from Ireland to the President of the Board of Trade in regard to lights and buoys along the Irish coast, and the answer of the right hon. Gentleman in every case had been that he was perfectly helpless, and that he had no authority over the Irish Lights Commissioners. That certainly was a state of things which should not prevail. Mercantile bodies in Ireland, harbour authorities, and chambers of commerce had asked to be allowed some representation on the board, but they had been steadily refused. The result was that the board was an obsolete authority, it was very far behind the time, and he could quote scores of cases within his own knowledge during recent years where the shipping community had suffered in consequence.

Some three years ago Limerick, which is an important seaport, and the harbour commissioners of this port, who were a body of merchants second to none in the country, applied for a lighthouse in a particular portion of the River Shannon with which the Irish Lights Commissioners had to deal. Now, the portion of that river controlled by the harbour commissioners was remarkably well lighted, but the sixteen miles of it over which the Irish Lights Commissioners had control, and which was a most dangerous portion, especially in hazy weather, had only one light. The Limerick Harbour Commissioners had memorialised the Irish Lights Commissioners on the subject, and had sent a deputation to Dublin to explain how by the erection at a small cost of a lighthouse all difficulty could be avoided. But, although the cost was small, their application had been ignored. At the same time, while the Irish Lights Commissioners refused to defray the small expenditure which this necessary improvement would have involved, they sent yachts cruising round the coast at the expense of the shipping community which had to pay the light dues. There was another case in Kenmare Bay in the county of Kerry. There was a rock known as the Maiden, and he himself had a somewhat narrow escape some four years ago of coming to grief upon it. Had there been, however, a gas buoy on the spot there would have been no danger whatever, but there was only an obsolete bell-buoy which was inaudible in rough weather. He thought it would be wise on the part of the Chancellor of the Exchequer and of the President of the Board of Trade to accept this Bill. Cases of the kind he had mentioned could be multiplied all round the coasts of these countries, and he certainly would impress upon the Irish Lights Commissioners the desirability of having inspectors to make frequent visits with a view to ascertaining whether the moorings of the different buoys were in their proper places. In regard to yachts he could not, for the life of him, see why pleasure yachts, which employed a large number of people, should be charged light dues at all. If the Royal Navy were exempted from these dues why should not pleasure yachts be also exempted? He hoped that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would promise favourable consideration to this Bill.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis) said he rose to support the Second Reading of the Bill although he was not a shipowner, neither was he in any way connected with shipping except that he was the owner of one small sailing yacht. He did not quite agree with the hon. Member who had just sat down in his view that yachts ought to be exempted from payment of these dues. He thought they should pay them. They were well able to do so, and were also willing to do so. He, at any rate, had never yet been sued for light dues, he had always paid them most readily. He was glad to see the Bill introduced this year, because in the year 1898 he had introduced a Resolution in the House of Commons embodying the central principle of this measure, namely, that the expenses of lighthouses, buoys, and beacons should be borne by the State. He was sorry to say that on that occasion he was abandoned by the great body of shipowners, who voted against him, and he found himself in a small minority of thirty-five. To-day the very same principle was embodied in this Bill. He, however, proposed to return good for evil. He would heap coals of fire on the heads of those who were bringing forward this Bill, but who opposed the very same thing in 1898. Why should the Navy be entirely exempted from payment of light dues? All other forms of Government property had to contribute to local taxation. That principle was generally recognised, it was felt that any charge which fell upon private citizens in respect of household property should also be paid by the Government in respect of its property. He never could understand, too, why foreign warships were exempted. Why, in the name of heaven, did they give them that exemption in respect of light dues? They did not supply them with provisions or coal on lower terms than they did other vessels, and therefore there was no defence for such an exemption. He recommended the Chancellor of the Exchequer to go to the Imperial centre—Birmingham—and there he would learn that foreign warships would rather pay double rates than pay none at all. Again, it should be remembered that many vessels had the advantage of our lights when they were passing up and down the Channel, and that unless they came into our ports they paid nothing in the form of light dues. Further than that British shipowners not only had to pay light dues on British coasts, but they had also to pay light dues to other countries.

The President of the Board of Trade had said that the Board had control over the expenditure of the lighthouse authorities. He did not think that was quite right. Was it not a fact that the establishment of Trinity House was fixed by Order in Council, and that beyond the numbers of the establishment the Board had no control whatever over the expenditure. He would like to refer the right hon. Gentleman to Section 659 of the Merchant Shipping Act, which laid it down——

MR. GERALD BALFOUR said that the Board of Trade had practically complete control over the expenditure.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES said his point was that there was no such complete control.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR presumed it could be altered by another Order in Council.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES said that was no doubt true, but there was one permanent Order in Council giving the establishment; and it was only in regard to expenses beyond that establishment that the right hon. Gentleman had any control. The admirable and up-to-date system of lighting on the French coast from Dunkirk to Bayonne was in every respect infinitely superior to the British system. The English lights were not very bad, but they were not very good, and it was impossible to get the lighting authority to keep them up to date. He respected Trinity House for its antiquity, but not for much else. The Brethren were gentlemen who had seen excellent service, and they, doubtless, did their best, but it was not good enough. They constantly resisted the establishment of new lights and buoys and the modernisation of the electric light on the ground of insufficiency of funds. An especial ground of contention was whether a proposed light was a local or a general light, and the point was usually wrangled over for two or three years before the light was fixed. There was neither sufficient authority nor sufficient money to supply the lights, beacons, and buoys that were needed, and the result was serious danger and damage to shipping. The lighting of the coast was undoubtedly a national duty. Not only was it recognised as such by every other civilised country, but it had been recognised from the beginning in this country as a part of the Royal prerogative and duty. The only reason it had been so inadequately performed was that, as the Crown could do no wrong, Ministers had advised successive Sovereigns that this part of the Royal prerogative might be laid aside, and that nothing more need be done than could be covered by the sums extorted from the merchant shipping. One would have thought that this country would have been the first instead of the last to recognise this work as a public duty. This country, more than all others, was the creature of the sea; it subsisted largely, and had achieved its present position mainly, through the efforts of its sons in going up and down the seas, carrying for the whole world.

He had been somewhat shocked by a whip which had been issued, calling upon agriculturists to oppose this Bill. Such an appeal was not only unpatriotic, but shabby. Since 1896 agriculturists had received £1,300,000 per annum in relief of their rates; corresponding sums had been granted to Scotland and Ireland, so that probably £2,000,000 a year had been provided out of public taxes to alleviate the lot of the agriculturist. He did not complain of that now, but he thought agriculturists showed a very poor front indeed in objecting to the payment of £400,000 for what was far more a national duty than the relief of agricultural rates. The Chancellor of the Exchequer ought not to raise the banner of economy on the present occasion. The right hon. Gentleman had just assented to a bargain whereby we were to finance the Cunard Company at a cost of about £7,000,000 of public money, and if he could afford to do that, he could afford this £400,000. Shipowners asked merely for justice. Having been endowed by the Almighty with an island possessing a dangerous coast line, the British public ought to perform their manifest duty of placing beacons and buoys where they were required. Again and again the question of the lighting of the coast and the incidence of the charges therefore had been considered by Committees of this House, and the conclusion always arrived at was that the duty should be placed on the public funds. It would be difficult, if not impossible, to find a charge which more properly belonged to the public funds. With regard to the Bill itself, the draftsman, if he was acquainted with the Standing Orders of this House, must have been aware that even if it passed its Second Reading absolutely nothing would have been done. The central feature of the Bill was contained in Clause 4, which proposed to charge lighthouse expenses on funds to be provided by Parliament. But that clause could not be passed, or even considered, unless a Minister was ready to recommend it, a contingency which past experience caused him to doubt. But although the Standing Orders prohibited, except on the recommendation of a Minister of the Crown, the imposition of any charges upon the subject, there was no order prohibiting a private Member to charge on existing taxes a sum by way of interception. The charge for the relief of agricultural rates was levied in that way. It was not a new charge laid upon the subject; it was a charge laid upon an existing charge.

*MR. SPEAKER: I think the hon. Member is now discussing the Standing Orders of the House rather than the Bill.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES admitted he was going a little outside the Bill. But that at any rate was how it could have been done, and when the proper time came he would probably propose a new clause in that sense in substitution for Clause 4. Clause 6 proposed to hand the whole control of lighthouses, buoys, and beacons to the Board of Trade. That Department was not the proper authority to manage these things. This was a seafaring question, and other seafaring questions, such as the surveying of the coast, the making of charts, the issuing of sailing directions, and the revising of the lights list, were dealt with only by the Admiralty, which was a seafaring body, whereas the Board of Trade was not. In fact, he doubted whether the right hon. Gentleman at the head of that Department knew the difference between a hawse pipe and a logarithm. But if Clause 4, as he had said, showed a lack of resource on the part of the draftsman, Clauses 7 and 8 showed almost too much resource. It was proposed that the Trinity Board, the Northern Lights Commissioners, and the Irish Lights Commissioners should be replaced by committees having upon them a majority of shipping insurance and mercantile representatives. That was altogether unreasonable. It would have been reasonable enough under the present system where those interests provided the funds; but by this Bill the expenses would be placed on the Estimates and become a public charge, and to hand over the whole control of a public fund to such committees would be extremely improper. These clauses, together with Clause 9, would certainly require amendment, but inasmuch as the Bill affirmed a right principle he should support the Second Reading.

*SIR JOHN LENG (Dundee) said that if objection were taken to the transference of this charge to the public funds, it should be borne in mind that £400,000 in these days was a very small sum. Millions were now spoken of in this House as though they were £5 notes, and Members were entitled to tell the Government that if they were a little less ready to embark on great and small wars they would find no difficulty in meeting claims which on their merits were irresistible. The greatest shipping country in the world ought surely to be put in the same position with regard to the lighting of its coasts as not only every other civilised, but as many so-called uncivilised countries already occupied. It was an extraordinary anomaly that a country whose subjects were more concerned than those of any other country in having the coasts properly lighted should allow that duty to be discharged at the cost of the interests involved. It was time the Government thought Imperially on the question, and put an end to the present anomalous position. With regard to the transfer of the administration to the Board of Trade, the record of that Department in relation to railway matters was not such as to recommend the extension of its powers of control to any other great interest. Unfortunately the Board was already suspect in the matter of lighting. Some years ago the Associated Chambers of Commerce repeatedly urged the Board of Trade to appoint a Committee with real powers of control over existing lighting administration. An Advisory Committee was appointed, but it was denied any real powers of control. The temperately written statement of the chairman of that Advisory Committee was not only an indictment but a strong condemnation of the present administration of the lighthouses under the supervision of the Board of Trade. He would far rather build on the foundation of the London Trinity House, or see the administration of lighthouses placed under the Admiralty.

He doubted whether the *personnel* of Trinity House could be improved upon. The Elder and the Younger Brethren were men who had spent their lives at sea, had the command of ships, and obtained such a reputation in the service as entitled them to be placed in the honourable positions they now occupied. He agreed that the lighting was not perfect, but so far as Trinity House was concerned it was by far the best administration we had in this country. The constitution of the Northern Lights Commission was much more objectionable. Most of the Commissioners were lawyers—sheriffs of counties; they were appointed because they lived mainly in Edinburgh, they had to visit the counties periodically, and so could make inquiries as to the lights, and were able to attend the meetings in Edinburgh.

He submitted, however, that with the improved facilities for travelling there was no reason why they in Scotland should not now have a board largely representative of the shipping and commercial interests. The administration at present was really in the hands of the officials and the consulting engineer, as the lawyers knew little or nothing about the lights, and had to rely on the permanent and expert officials. In all the ports there were men with practical knowledge of the rivers, estuaries, and harbours, whose opinions and advice would be of value if they were called into consultation. He thought the time had arrived when this matter should be dealt with, and if they were to have an Advisory Committee it should be a body of practical men empowered to advise in all the details of the administration. If this discussion should not lead to any immediate effect he hoped it would clear away any doubts the Government might have on the subject, and that, if not this year, at least at an early period it would be dealt with in a really practical, effective, and statesmanlike manner.

*Mr. HAIN (Cornwall, St. Ives) said he entirely failed to understand the *non possumus* attitude taken up by the Board of Trade on this subject, but he was somewhat disposed to hope for a better state of things. He quite agreed with the remarks of his hon. friend the Member for Newcastle with respect to the relations which of recent years had grown up between the shipowners and the Board of Trade, and he hoped that, in view of that better understanding, the Board would admit the justice of the shipowners' contention that these lighthouse dues should be a national charge, and not one specially placed on the British mercantile marine. They had heard that this country enjoyed the doubtful honour of being associated with Turkey in respect to the charging of light dues upon shipping and in making a considerable profit upon the transaction. He thought the case of the tonnage dues levied in the United States of America upon British and Canadian shipping, merely because of the infinitesimal sum which was levied in respect of light dues for their shipping visiting our ports and harbours, was a very strong one. From the figures available it appeared that we had to pay a sovereign for every shilling we received in that respect, and yet we called ourselves a business people. The system of placing a charge for lights upon the mercantile marine had been condemned by no less than four Select Committees and a Royal Commission. British shipowners were as patriotic as any other section of the community, but surely there was no reason why the charge for lighting our coasts for the benefit of the Royal Navy should be especially placed upon their shoulders. One argument used againt the abolition of light dues on the mercantile marine was that by doing so we should lose a considerable sum of money now levied upon foreign ships visiting our harbours. He was prepared as a shipowner to admit foreign ships into our ports on precisely the same conditions as we claimed for ourselves, and in the abolition of light dues he would give them the same advantages as British shipowners claimed. He could show that the Board of Trade by one stroke of the pen could make up this loss. If the President of the Board of Trade would remove the unfair competition of foreign ships in our own ports, if he would remove the preference we now gave to foreign ships coming into our ports in the matter of tonnage, measurement——

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: That has been done.

*Mr. HAIN said it had been done in some instances but not in all, and he knew that his right hon. friend preferred to proceed by negotiation rather than by Order of the Board of Trade.

Mr. GERALD BALFOUR: We have made such Orders. It is true that in the case of French ships the Order has been suspended because the French Government have intimated that they desire to put the law in the same position as ours.

*Mr. HAIN said he was very glad indeed to hear that the matter was so far advanced, but there were other matters to be considered such as the regulation about the load-line. At all events foreign shipowners would have no reason to complain if we insisted on their having the same tonnage measurement and load-line for their ships as for British ships. If we yielded to them the charge in respect of light dues, he did not think there could be any question of retaliation on the part of any foreign Government. It had been said that the light dues paid by the British shipowner eventually fell on the consumer. That was altogether a mistaken idea. He would suppose the case of two ships precisely the same size loading side by side at a Black Sea port and chartered for an identically similar freight. One of the ships was ordered to discharge in the port of London, and the other at Rotterdam, or one of the other great Continental ports. The ship that came to London had to pay in respect of 4,500 tons of cargo after allowing for the 12½ per cent. rebate, £20 for light dues, whereas the sister ship that went to a Continental port was entirely exempted. If the ship came to London three, four, or five times a year the amount charged for lights made a considerable preference in favour of the Continental port. Could it be wondered at that shipowners using British ports should ask to be placed on equal terms with those using the ports of foreign nations. He held in his hand the whip which had been sent out against this Bill in the agricultural interest. It referred to the shipping industry of this country as being one of the most prosperous. He could only say that the framers of the whip had a very curious idea of prosperity. He was certain that they could have no acquaintance whatever with the present condition of British shipping. He asserted with a full knowledge of the facts that there was not a single direction in which the British shipowner to-day could send a ship with the certainty, he would not say of making a profit, but of avoiding very considerable loss. There might be a few ships under most favourable conditions here and there earning a profit, but on the whole the British shipping industry at the present time was, and for a considerable period had been, under a wave of deep depression, and it could not be regarded as in any sense a profitable industry. He thought, therefore, that the imposition of the light dues should be removed from the shoulders of this great national industry. He based this appeal on the view that the maintenance of lighthouses should be a national charge and not one upon shipowners.

*MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland) said the Bill under consideration divided itself into two distinct parts. The principal object of the measure was to meet a demand made by the shipowners, or rather, two demands, because they asked on the one hand to be relieved of the light dues, and, on the other hand, that they should have complete control over money which they had no share whatever in raising. He could not conceive any system that would be more wasteful and extravagant. The board of Trade was to be absolutely powerless in the hands of gentlemen representing the shipping and mercantile interest, though they did not contribute practically a penny. A complaint had been made in regard to the Scotch Board, which was composed of lawyers, provosts, and gentlemen of the highest standing. He would infinitely prefer such a Board to one consisting exclusively of representatives of the shipping interest who would be more likely to work for their own particular advantage. It was a very much better board than they were likely to get under this Bill. He did not think the shipping interest was in so bad a state as the hon. Member for the St. Ives Division had represented. The mercantile marine had been referred to as a great national asset, second only to the British Navy. How had the mercantile marine treated the British seamen. In 1901 there were 134,862 British seamen, and 74,168 foreign seamen in our mercantile marine. The falling off in British seamen was because they were not sufficiently housed and fed. Between the years 1880 and 1891 there had been a large increase in the *personnel* of the mercantile marine, while the number of British seamen had decreased.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member seems to be entering on a different question from that embraced in the Bill.

*MR. CATHCART WASON said he would not pursue that argument further and had only alluded to it as the hon.

Member introducing the Bill had spread himself a bit on the great national asset of our mercantile marine. It was said that this great national asset was in a decaying state, and that it would be put in a better position if the shipowners got rid of the payment of ship dues. That he doubted. It seemed to be an untenable position, to which the House would never assent, for the shipowners to ask for relief from this taxation on the one hand, and control over the lighthouse administration on the other.

SIR ROBERT ROPNER (Stockton) said that the hon. Members who had addressed the House, with the exception of the hon. Member who had just sat down, had spoken very forcibly in favour of the Bill. There was some force in what that hon. Gentleman had said that if the lighting of our coasts were made a national charge there would be no necessity for having an Advisory Committee. As to the hon. Member's statement that the shipping trade was not in so bad a way as the House might suppose, he would like to compliment the hon. Member that he was not a shipowner, for if he had been he would not have made a statement of that kind. He could assure the House that the shipping industry of this country to-day was in a most precarious state and had been so for two years, and he could not see any favourable outlook. There was probably not a single steam or sailing vessel which started on a voyage with the view of making a profit, the only hope was to make both ends meet. There were, however, some steamship companies which carried passengers and were in the exceptional position of being able to pay their way, but that did not affect the general mercantile marine of the country. There was, he believed, a general feeling on both sides of the House that it was unfair to call upon shipowners to pay for the lighting of our coasts. Our Navy did not pay one single farthing towards the lighting of our coasts, and he could not understand why one class of the community should be called upon to pay for what benefited the nation at large. It must be admitted that shipowners were unfairly and unjustly treated. It was only ships which frequented our ports which had to pay, though ships sailing along our coasts used the lights just as much. This tax was levied upon the shipowners—what about the cargoes which were carried, and the passengers? Those benefited equally. Were they to go scot free? It had been argued that shipowners were able to take care of themselves by insisting upon raising freights to make up for the payment of light dues. But shipowners found it impossible to protect themselves in this way. When our ships started from our ports they had to pay light dues, but though foreign ships come through the Channel bound for ports in the Baltic, etc., and used our lights, they did not have to pay at all, even though they got as much use out of our lights as our own ships. The tax upon our ships could not, therefore, be justified. It had already been pointed out—and he would like to repeat it—that all civilised nations, with the exception of Turkey—if Turkey could be called a civilised nation—made the lighting of the coasts a national charge. Why should it be different in this country? The tonnage tax was the only one charged at the foreign ports, and this charge was made only for harbour and dock dues, but on the continent the harbours were built and kept up by the Government. Our Government did not interfere with the building of harbours and docks, and ships at our ports had not only to pay light dues but also harbour and dock dues.

There had been many Select Committees and Royal Commissions to inquire into this subject, and they had unanimously reported in favour of the lighting of the coasts being made a national charge. He had been a member of the Select Committee on Steamship Subsidies, and all the witnesses—and there were a great number—recommended that light dues should be borne by the nation and that lights should not be made a special tax upon the shipping of this country. The shipping of this country had already to compete with the subsidised and bounty-fed mercantile marines of other countries. British shipowners did not make any claim for subsidies; all they asked was that they should be given fair play. Let there be no special charge upon our ships which was not borne by other nations. That surely was a very small demand. Large amounts were collected from shipowners for lights which were not applied for that purpose. He believed that some £1,800,000 was diverted entirely for matters other than paying for the lighthouse service. The light dues collected from the shipowning community was something like £500,000 a year. He admitted that something like £180,000 or £190,000 of that was collected in respect of foreign vessels frequenting our ports, and that if the charge for lights were made a national one that money would unquestionably be lost. In America tonnage dues were charged upon British ships because American ships coming to our country had to pay light dues; but, whereas American vessels coming to our ports, being few in number, paid only about £5,000, our ships going to American ports paid tonnage dues of £60,000 or £70,000. There had, no doubt, been a reduction of 12½ per cent. in light dues last year, but that reduction should have been made years ago, because for many years there had been a surplus in respect of light dues of something like £60,000 per annum. It was only fair to say that Trinity House had done excellent work, but that had nothing to do with the unfair levying of these dues. If there were an Advisory Committee it should have control over the whole of the light dues collected, and not be confined to criticising the expenditure of the fifth part of this sum on new works. The actual estimated expenditure on new works for the five years from 1900 to 1904 was £580,875 and this was £330,875 in excess of the amount which the Committee of 1896 considered was necessary.

The Congress of the Chambers of Commerce for the whole of the Empire, to which delegates from our different possessions came, passed a resolution to the effect that it was detrimental to the interests of the commercial shipping of the United Kingdom, and the Colonies, that light dues should be levied upon shipowners, and that the Government should be requested to give effect to the recommendation of the Select Committee of the House of Commons upon Subsidies with a view to giving fairer conditions for British shipowners in competing with their foreign rivals. This was a question which affected the commerce of the whole country and the Colonies. He hoped the President of the Board of Trade and the Chancellor of the Exchequer would think Imperially on this matter, and would recommend to the House that this tax should be levied upon the whole of the community instead of upon one class. If the Government could not agree to this Bill at present he hoped that next year, at any rate, they would bring in a Bill to make the upkeep of lights on our coast a national charge.

MR. AUSTIN TAYLOR (Liverpool, East Toxteth) said he thought it was quite clear from the course of the debate, both last year and this, that the Government had no case whatever. The whole weight of the argument, as far as the merits of the Bill were concerned, was clearly against the Government—and they were driven to fall back upon financial reasons for delaying the removal of what was admittedly an unfair burden on British shipping. He joined with other Members in reprobating very severely the whip which had been issued on behalf of the agricultural interest against this Bill. The agricultural interest had issued a whip against this Bill, in which they said—

> "No case has been made out for the relief of one of our most prosperous industries from a charge that has always fallen upon it, at the cost of persons engaged in agriculture and other failing industries."

He did not wish to enter into a controversy as to whether shipping was one of our most prosperous industries, but it was certain that it was not in a state of prosperity at the present time. Like all other businesses in this country it was passing through a period of extreme depression, and the statements already made in the debate as to the extreme difficulty of finding profitable employment for shipping were absolutely justified. But if shipping was a profitable industry, generally speaking, why was it prosperous? It had achieved its prosperity entirely owing to the initiative of the traders themselves, in the face of obstructive and vexatious legislation passed by that House against their particular trade. Therefore, if there was any argument to be drawn from the fact that it was more or less a prosperous industry, surely it was that, instead of rewarding it for its enterprise by continuing an unjust burden, that House ought to relieve it from a burden which it ought never to have borne, and which in no other country, except Turkey, was imposed on that particular industry. He quite understood the point of view of agriculture. If there were no ships it would, of course, be immensely to the gain of agriculture. It was due to the shipping facilities of this country that agriculture had been exposed to very severe competition. It might be a lamentable result of increased facilities of communication between one part of the world and another that agriculture had suffered in this country, but he submitted that what they had to look at was not the particular results to agriculture, but the general results to the Empire at large of those increased facilities of communication.

Every argument seemed to him to point, for those who thought Imperially, not to hamper an industry which was in the last resort the basis on which the whole Empire rested, but to point rather in the direction of relieving it from those burdens which were peculiarly attached to it, and for which he honestly thought no justification existed. He appealed to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, not so much in his financial position as on the ground of his economic sympathies. This was a tax which specially discriminated in favour of foreigners. Last year the then Chancellor of the Exchequer—the right hon. Member for Croydon—took up the extraordinary position that it was a tax on the consumer. He thought that if the matter was examined impartially it would be admitted that this was a tax which discriminated in favour of the foreigner. He did not desire to go into the question of the practice of other countries, because that might be dangerous ground. He did not think that foreign countries were the model on which this country should always base its policy. But he was surprised at the terms of the whip to which he had referred, and the reasons it brought forward why this particular tax should continue on shipping. One of the reasons was that not only was shipping a most prosperous industry, but that this was a charge which had always fallen on it. He had never heard a more extraordinary argument from the mouth of a fiscal reformer than that. If there was any validity in the new economic ideas which were fermenting in the public mind, he should have thought that the very last argument which would have been brought forward by some of those who signed that circular was that this was a tax which had always fallen on shipping. Surely if there was no case on its merits for shipping bearing this tax it was no argument in favour of it, even from the Conservative point of view, that it had always borne it.

He desired to address one or two inquiries to the President of the Board of Trade in regard to the existing nature of the control which was exercised by the Board of Trade over the lighthouse boards. Had the Board power to control the lighthouse boards so as to erect new lighthouses where required, to compel the establishment of telegraphic communication between a lighthouse and the shore, or to compel the boards to adopt a particular system, as for instance, electricity or gas as a means of illumination? He expected that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would be able to make out a case for not doing this act of scanty justice to a great Imperial asset on the score that the National Exchequer was in a depleted condition. It was perfectly true that this country was passing through a wave of extreme depression, but, if this Bill was passed, no effect would be felt on the finances until two years had elapsed. Surely those who were engaged in the business of this country, whatever their ideas on fiscal matters might be, had sufficient knowledge of the recuperative power of business enterprise to feel some confidence that after four years on the down grade since the war there was a very fair prospect that in the next two years they would see a reasonable rally in the business done by this country. That would inevitably be reflected in the revenue of the country which the then Chancellor of the Exchequer, whoever he might be, might have to deal with, and he hoped the present Chancellor of the Exchequer would be sufficiently optimistic to look forward with hope over the next two years and give this small measure of relief to what, after all, in an Imperial sense was the essential connecting link between the most remote parts of our great Empire.

Mr. J F. HOPE (Sheffield. Brightside) said that in rising to oppose this Bill he was not acting at the instigation of anyone. He quite admitted that there was a great deal to be said for the objects that this Bill sought to obtain, and much that had been put forward by previous speakers had undoubtedly shown that their object was a very excellent one, but there were many other excellent objects that hon. Members brought forward from time to time. They often had proposals brought forward when the Estimates were under discussion for increasing the salaries of Government employees, and a very good case could be, and had been, made on those occasions. Anyone who had heard the hon. Member for Woolwich, some time back, would feel that in regard to the question of unskilled labourers in Government employment, a great deal was to be said for fixing a minimum wage. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Somerset had come forward with a proposal, not long ago, that the whole cost of training colleges for teachers should be borne by the National Exchequer, and, looking to the need there was for training teachers, that again was a proposal for which one must feel very considerable sympathy. Another hon. Member brought before the House, the other night, the question of feeding the children of very poor parents who were compelled by the Education Act to go to school, and he pointed out that when the State enforced the education of these children it should make some contribution in order that they might be in a proper condition to make use of the teaching imparted to them. He did not think that the proposal on the present occasion came forward on any stronger footing than these proposals he had mentioned. There was the question of the incidence of local taxation, and he thought that agricultural Members might fairly say that the relief granted some years ago had been swallowed up by additional rates. Undoubtedly other industries besides that of agriculture were very seriously hampered by what amounted to an Excise in the shape of constantly growing local rates. This was especially felt by industries such as those in the city he represented.

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member is not entitled to review the whole system of taxation in the country on this question.

Mr. J. F. HOPE: I was merely pointing out that there were other industries that were as much in need of relief as the shipping industry. During the present year it had been found necessary to put off a great addition to the national armament in regard to the Army to another year on account of the state of the National Exchequer. They knew that one of the most serious questions in regard to the Army was the re-armament of the artillery. There were a number of other subjects of equal or greater importance and urgency which had been postponed, and this particular proposal was by no means the most important or the most urgent of the various subjects which engaged the attention of Parliament and the country during the present year. This proposal involved a charge of some £500,000 on the National Exchequer That was equivalent in taxation to another halfpenny duty on tea, and if that item could not be subjected to further taxation, he would ask the friends of this proposal where the money was to come from, and on what taxable article would they recommend that it should be imposed? Of this £500,000 no less than £130,000 was derived from dues paid by foreigners, and he thought it would be a very difficult thing to argue before the taxpayers of the country that new taxation to the extent of £500,000 should be thrown on the general taxation, and that no less than £130,000 should be taken off the foreigners in this case. He was surprised at the absence of the advocates of economy from this debate, such as the hon. Member for Exeter, the hon. Member for Whitby, and the junior Member for Oldham, and he was more than astonished by the attitude of the hon. Member for King's Lynn, whom he had always regarded as a "*justum et tenacem propositi virum.*" He quite recognised that there was a strong case for this proposal, if there were more money, and he thought that there were ways in which that money could be obtained, although he could not refer to them now. Some day, perhaps, his hon. friend would bring in a Bill to restore the Navigation Acts, and then he would have great pleasure in supporting it, but in the meantime, as representative of the city of Sheffield, he must enter his humble protest against this burden being put on the community at large for the sake of a purely sectional interest.

MR. T. HARRINGTON (Dublin Harbour) could not quite agree with the proposals in the Bill by which it was sought to provide for the administration of the lights. There seemed to be a great deal of apprehension with reference to the powers exercised by the different lighting authorities, and the responsibility which had been cast upon them. But much of the adverse criticism upon their administration was really attributable to the very limited powers they possessed. The public were quite unaware how limited those powers were. The local authorities had been blamed by different speakers for not carrying out the numerous suggestions made from time to time for the improvement of the lighting of our coasts. For instance, the hon. Member had complained of a neglect to provide better lights in the Shannon, but was he aware that compliance with that demand would merely have thrown an additional burden upon an industry which was already complaining of having to bear it? No doubt it would be useful for the coast, but there would be an outcry by the general shipping community against the cost. The difficulty of the local authorities was in deciding whether demands of that nature should be carried out at the cost of the general shipping community. With regard to the Irish Lights Board he could speak from personal experience of the limited nature of their powers. He had officially attended many of the meetings of that body, and could tell the House that the invariable practice was to ask the sanction of the Board of Trade for expenditure, however small—even if it were only 7s. 6d.

MR. AUSTIN TAYLOR: Do the Board of Trade dictate the policy of the Lighthouse Board, or is it merely a question of controlling expenditure?

MR. T. HARRINGTON said it was a question of controlling expenditure. Nothing could be expended by the authority without the sanction of the Board of Trade outside the fixed charges, such as salaries. He could not see, however, how this Bill would better the state of affairs. If the burden were made a national one the system of administration would continue as at present. One of the defects in the Bill was that while it provided that the Board of Trade should have the whole administration, it at the same time destroyed the authority by which the local lights were administered. He had a good deal of fault to find with the system on which the Irish Board was constituted. Seventeen of the twenty-two Commissioners were co-opted and that was certainly not satisfactory. Still, as a whole, they were a body of gentlemen with a familiar knowledge of the officials whom they had to supervise, even down to the lighthouse keepers, and they paid a great deal of attention to their duties and certainly did their work conscientiously.

*MR. RITCHIE (Croydon) said the hon. Member who last spoke had put the supporters of the Bill in a dilemma. He had pointed out that while the main object of the Bill was to take the burden of the maintenance of the lights off the shoulders of the shipping community, the other provision was to secure to that community a large share of the management to the cost of which they were no longer to contribute. The hon. Gentleman had defended the action of the lighthouse authorities in Ireland and had spoken generally of the necessity for some local authority to deal with these questions. Every one with experience in the administration of the fund must agree that whatever the powers possessed by the Board of Trade, there must—if the money was to be properly administered—be some local authority to administer it.

He knew from his experience at the Board of Trade that there were frequent complaints from shipowners both in England and Scotland that certain lights which would be of advantage were not provided, but in a great many cases the lights proposed were such as should fall on local funds and not on the lighthouse funds. He was bound to say that he was not satisfied with the present constitution of the Irish Lights Board. He thought that they had acted imprudently in not co-opting to assist in their administration men who were capable of giving good sound advice and who had a full knowledge of the wants of the shipping community. He had had a good deal to do with the Northern Lights Board and he was perfectly certain that although it was largely composed of gentlemen who were members of local authorities and the legal profession, no board could more efficiently execute the work than they did. They were men of great capacity, and devoted themselves to their work in a manner which could not be excelled. As for Trinity House, it was well known that it had the regulation of the expenditure and it was only right and proper that the expenditure of the various boards should be controlled by a central board. He did not think that control was exercised in a manner disadvantageous to local administration. On the contrary, the supervision exercised by Trinity House was advantageous, and it would be difficult to have a body more fitted for its work. Perhaps the Advisory Committee recently constituted might be allowed larger powers. He certainly did not see why something should not be done in that direction.

With regard to the main question, he confessed he was entirely opposed to the suggestion that the cost of these lights should be put on the back of the already heavily burdened taxpayer. The amount contributed by the shipping community was infinitesimal compared with the annual value and size of the shipping interest of this country. It was a burden that the shipping interest had always borne; and, although at the present time shipping was not so prosperous as it had been, yet a year or two ago it was reaping enormous profits. Indeed, what had led to the present condition of trade, and to its not being so remunerative, was that a few years ago its prosperity was so great that ships were built on all hands. Prosperity was always followed by a period of slackness. But bearing in mind the large amount of taxation now imposed on the public, he was bound to say that this was certainly not the time to ask the taxpayer to find the money; and as to the suggestion that the imposition of light dues drove ships to foreign ports everyone knew that that was nonsense. The desirability of the Royal Navy's making a contribution to the cost of lighting the coasts was submitted to a Committee on which were several shipowners, and that Committee negatived the idea, feeling as they no doubt did that the Navy performed great and valuable service to the mercantile marine—a service which constituted a fair set-off to the exemption from these dues. That a great and usually prosperous industry should, year after year, ask for relief from this very small impost was not what one would expect. He hoped that the answer which had always been given to this demand would be given again—namely, that no grounds had been shown for shifting this burden from shoulders well able to bear it on to others much less able to bear it.

*MR. RENWICK (Newcastle-on-Tyne) was impressed by the fact that although the House had been debating this Bill ever since twelve o'clock they had just heard the first note of the opposition to its proposals. But he was glad that at last they had some inkling of what the objections to the Bill were. Let him at once say that the shipowners did not ask the House to assent to this Bill because their industry was not in a prosperous condition or because they wished for any dole, bounty or other form of charity whatever. They advocated the principle of the Bill because they believed it was the duty of the country to light its own coasts. We lived on an island surrounded by rocks and dangerous shoals. We had a channel which was navigated not only by ships bound to this country but also by vessels bound to the Continent, and it was our duty to see that our coasts were properly lighted. Then again, they held that if the shipowners paid the dues they ought to say how the money should be spent. The hon. Member for Orkney and Shetland had ridiculed the idea that the shipowners should have any voice in the administration of funds collected by the Treasury, but he would like to remind him of the formula that taxation and representation should go together. Yet for years and years the shipowners had paid the dues, and until a year or two ago they were not even allowed to appoint an Advisory Committee, which, however, had no power to insist on its advice being carried out—they therefore practically had no representation on the administrative authority. They had been told by an eminent member of the Advisory Committee—Sir Alfred Jones—that while the Board of Trade could and did control all expenditure for new works it could not and did not control works of maintenance and repairs. Yet the President of the Board of Trade in the earlier part of the debate claimed that the Board of Trade controlled all expenditure. He held in his hand a statement issued by the Liverpool Steamship Owners Association, which, on the 9th May, wrote to Trinity House asking for definite information with a view to the present debate, and expressing a desire to know precisely what control the Board of Trade had exercised over the following items of expenditure in the year 1903—viz.:—Amount expended in maintenance of lighthouses, £106,680; amount expended in maintenance of lightships, £97,870, and amount expended on maintenance of buoys and beacons, £13,179. What was the answer they got? A few lines dealing with Sir Alfred Jones's statement asserting that the Board of Trade could only veto expenditure on new work, and declining to enter into any controversy on the general question of lighthouse administration. Were they not entitled to ask the President of the Board of Trade if that body controlled expenditure on maintenance and repairs as well as on new works?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The Board of Trade has no power of initiating expenditure, but it has complete power of controlling it.

*****MR. RENWICK** very much regretted that that answer was not returned to the very courteous communication sent by the Liverpool Steamship Owners Association to Trinity House. What was the practice of other countries in regard to the lighting of their coasts? Recently many hon. Members paid a visit to France, and while crossing the Channel he drew the attention of several Members to the difference between the lighting of the English and French coasts, pointing out how the French Government undertook the duty with such excellent results. If the French Government considered it its duty to undertake that work, was it not equally the duty of the British Government to light their coast. The Channel was used by an enormous number of ships, many of which were not bound to our own ports, and in common humanity we should take care that our coasts were properly lighted. The shipowners were not appealing to that House *in formâ pauperis* for a dole of £300,000 or £400,000 a year. They had made a like appeal in periods of prosperity and of adversity, and they based it on the ground that it was only just the State should bear this burden. Much had been said about the Bill providing that shipowners should have some representation on the Board of Trade Committee administering the light dues. Those who had any knowledge of that Department would admit that that was necessary, inasmuch as there was no Board of Trade in reality. There was a President and there were heads of the different departments, but there was no Board of Trade. Therefore, they were really conferring a benefit on the Board of Trade by suggesting that these gentlemen should be appointed to assist the Department. The really vital part of the Bill, however, was the affirmation of the principle that it was the duty of the State to pay for the lighting of the coasts. There were many matters of detail to which he might have referred. but, as his colleague had gone very exhaustively into the matter, he would merely state, with reference to the Navy not paying its share of taxation, that while the Navy did something to protect the coasts the lights did something also, and, inasmuch as the whole country contributed to the cost of the Navy, he thought the whole country ought also to contribute to the cost of the lights.

SIR JAMES JOICEY (Durham Chester-le-Street) said that after a very careful study of the question he had come to the conclusion that the claim of the shipping interest in this matter was a very just and proper one. He quite admitted the force of the argument of the right hon. Member for Croydon that this was not the time to ask for any reduction of taxation in the interests of a particular industry, but, though he would like to see public expenditure reduced, and to his mind there was great extravagance in the public expenditure, that was no reason why justice should not be done to the shipowning industry. It was true that this burden had been borne by the shipping industry for a very long time, but that again was no reason why the unjust burden should be continued. Again and again a good case had been made out on behalf of the shipowners, and he could not see why the Government did not remedy the grievance. Other nations paid the cost of lighting their coasts, and we, the largest shipping nation in the world, ought to follow their example in that respect. If other nations adopted our policy and taxed our ships for their lights it would be considered a great hardship. America, for instance, charged no light dues upon any but British ships. and thus German and other vessels had that advantage in competing with us. It had been said that the shipping industry made a great deal of money. It was unfortunately one of the most speculative of industries, and, taking the last twenty years, the profits upon the capital employed had been small. The mere fact that because during the last two or three years, in consequence of the war and other causes, shipowners had made up a little lost ground, was no argument against their receiving this small measure of justice. The cost of lighting the streets was placed, not upon a particular industry in those streets, but upon all who benefited by the lighting. In the same way, not only the shipowners, but the importers and consumers of goods, benefited by the lighting of the coast, and consequently should help to bear the cost. If ever there was a charge which ought to be a national burden, this surely was one. If, however, the cost was to be charged upon shipping, he could not understand why the Navy should not bear its share. Some years ago it was the practice to exempt Government buildings from rates, but it had been recognised that that was unjust to the general ratepayers, and a contribution was now made. He thought a similar course ought to be followed with regard to the Navy and the lights. He submitted that the demand of the Bill was a very reasonable one, and he hoped that if the Chancellor of the Exchequer could not accede to the demand at present, he would, at any rate, hold out hopes of doing so as soon as the finances of the country were in a more satisfactory condition.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH (Bristol, W.) said that, with regard to one of two objects of this Bill, he desired to express an opinion based upon his four years' experience at the Board of Trade. Every one must admit that the constitution of these lighthouse boards was full of anomalies, and when he went to the Board of Trade he certainly held the view that it would be desirable to revise that constitution. But his experience convinced him that whatever authority was appointed to administer the lighting of the coasts it would not be likely to be better administered than by the existing bodies. For four years of his life he took a very active interest in the question, and spoke with some knowledge of the efficiency of the work that was done. The Trinity Brethren were skilled men of great naval experience, and he could not imagine any men better qualified for dealing with the work they had in hand. Of course there might be cases in which the shipowners were not quite satisfied with the places in which lights were put; or they might hold that the number was not sufficient; but it did not follow from that that the House should do what they were asked to do in this Bill, which was practically to allow the shipowners, at the public expense, to put up as many lights round the coast as they might think necessary for their purpose.

He had great sympathy in this matter with the Chancellor of the

Exchequer. His right hon. friend was going to be attacked on Monday next by the other side of the House for gross extravagance in the administration of finance, and to the Motion of the Leader of the Opposition he had no doubt the hon. Baronet opposite, who had spoken in favour of this Bill, would give his support. What was the history of the last three days? On Wednesday they had a Motion coming from the advocates of economy on the other side of the House asking for the imposition of a very considerable burden on the taxpayers of the country for the benefit of Members. Yesterday he heard one Member denouncing the acquisition of revenue of any kind from the Post Office, and advocating the employment of any surplus for the better payment of those employed in the service, or for the provision of greater facilities to the public. And to-day they had what to his mind was at this time the most audacious proposition ever put before the House of Commons from a powerful and, on the whole, a prosperous interest—that they should relieve it of the payment of £350,000 a year and put the burden on the shoulders of the general taxpayer. Although he represented one of the principal shipping ports of the country, he had resisted this demand for the last twelve or fifteen years, and he resisted it because it would be by no means such an act of substantial justice as his hon. friend the Member for Liverpool had described it to be. He was aware that for the moment the shipping industry was not so prosperous as it had been. He recognised to the full the ability with which the hon. Baronet the Member for Chester-le-Street advocated the claims of distressed industries. But shipping was one of the greatest industries in the country, and in spite of the vicissitudes through which it had passed it had undoubtedly prospered on the whole.

His hon. friend below him said they claimed only justice, and urged that it was the duty of the general taxpayers to light the coasts of the United Kingdom. But the people of this country had other duties to perform besides that. They had to keep up the roads and maintain the poor. How much did the shipping industry contribute to those objects? He did not ask it to contribute, but if they were to treat these things as part of the general duty of the taxpayers, he thought the shipping industry ought to pay rates on the value of its property if it wished to be relieved from the maintenance of the lights on the coasts. He could only say that he did not regard this as a matter of justice. He thought the shipping industry could and ought to bear the cost of lighting the coasts as they had always borne it; but if they wished to get rid of the burden the whole question must be considered, and then he hoped some proposal would come from them to aid the ratepayers in bearing the heavy burdens of local taxation.

MR. CHARLES McARTHUR (Liverpool, Exchange) said that only two speeches strongly adverse to the Bill had been made, and they were by ex-Chancellors of the Exchequer. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Bristol had expressed his satisfaction with the existing lighthouse authorities. No one would question the judgment of the right hon. Gentleman in matters which came within his own sphere, but, in regard to this question, shipowners and everybody immediately concerned were extremely dissatisfied with the present condition of things, and if he had to choose between the opinion of those who understood the question and the opinion of his right hon. friend, who, after all, had no practical knowledge of the question, he was bound to accept the view of those who understood the matter. He protested against the observation of his right hon. friend that this was an audacious proposal. If a large number of Members of the House were convinced that this was an unjust burden and had come forward for the last twenty years with a proposal to remedy it, could it be regarded as audacious for them to continue to do so? The present system involved taxation without representation, the people who paid for the lights having no voice in their management. It was unfair that the shipping industry should have to pay a charge which benefited not only shipowners, but the owners of goods, passengers, passing vessels, and the

Royal Navy. The present practice threw upon a particular trade a charge which ought to be borne by the nation at large, and it was at variance with the practice of almost every other civilised nation.

The essential might be separated from the non-essential provisions of the Bill. The essential provisions were the transference of the administration of the lights from the present authorities to the Government, and payment of the cost by the Exchequer. It had been suggested that the Admiralty was the proper authority, but inasmuch as the Admiralty had to do with the Navy, while the Board of Trade had to do with the trade and shipping of the country, the Board of Trade appeared to be the proper authority for dealing with this matter. Nobody who had really examined the Bill could contend that the shipowners desired to relieve themselves of the cost of the lights, and at the same time to obtain control over them. They desired to do nothing of the sort. They wished to transfer the cost of the lights to the public funds, but they proposed that the absolute control should be vested in the Board of Trade. Certain committees were suggested, but they were merely advisory, and had no power to do anything of themselves. It was assumed that, as the Board of Trade had asked the assistance of the shipping interest in regard to new works, they would, if they had entire control of the matter, wish to have the assistance of advisory committees on a larger scale, and that was all that was intended by the Bill. The Board of Trade had no power over the lighthouse service, and they had no power to build new lighthouses or make any change whatever. It was quite true that the Board of Trade had a veto over new works, and in that way possessed a certain amount of control, but they had no power whatever to initiate expenditure, and that was just the power they wished the Board of Trade to have. They considered the lighthouse authorities had shown incompetence. He did not wish to say anything disrespectful of the members of the lighthouse boards, but they had had no practical experience of the work, and they had to depend absolutely upon their officers.

The opinion of the commercial community was unanimous that these charges ought to be removed. This was not only the opinion of shipowners, but also of the members of the harbour boards and the various Chambers of Commerce, and opinion in the country was solid that this change ought to be made. Therefore he hoped that the Government would seriously consider the proposal which was now made. The promoters did not adhere to the Bill in all its particulars, but they left the details to the Committee stage. It might be that the authorities proposed to be constituted under the Bill could be improved, and more representative members placed upon them, but they did ask that the shipping trade should be relieved of this charge, and that the Government should assume the entire control of the lighthouse service. If a large number of Members of the House were convinced that this was an unjust burden and had come forward for the last twenty years with a proposal to remedy it, could it be regarded as audacious for them to continue to do so?

*MAJOR JAMESON (Clare, W.) said they had just listened to the speeches of two former Chancellors of the Exchequer, both of whom had been also

President of the Board of Trade. When he listened to the remarks of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Bristol he could not help thinking that although he was speaking as an ex-President of the Board of Trade the views he expressed were those of a Chancellor of the Exchequer. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Croydon said he thought it was a terrible thing for the great shipping industry to endeavour to shift these charges on to the already overburdened shoulders of the British taxpayer. He thought those two right hon. Gentlemen might have fought this question out over the shilling duty on corn. That was a way in which this money might have been raised without any detriment to the British taxpayer. But there was a more important question to consider. Although the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Bristol called this an audacious proposal, he wished to point out that no proposal which was not audacious ever succeeded in this House. It was only by the tenacity of the British and the Irish race that they were able to pass any reforms which they believed to be right and just.

There was one point to which he desired to call the attention of the President of the Board of Trade. He had told the House that the Board of Trade had complete control over the whole of the money that was the subject of this discussion. The right hon. Gentleman was an excellent President of the Board of Trade, but he denied that he had any such power of control. He would proceed to show what a humiliating position the right hon. Gentleman was placed in. The other day he asked the right hon. Gentleman a question in this House about certain instructions which had been given to lighthouse keepers, and he replied by stating that—

> "By the courtesy of the three lighthouse boards I am able to furnish the hon. Member with the following information."

Here they were dilly-dallying with the great commercial interests of this country which were absolutely necessary to keep the wolf from the doors of the people, and when a Member of the British Parliament asked the President of the Board of Trade an important question in regard to the lightships, the right hon. Gentleman was only enabled to reply by the courtesy of these three boards. That, in his opinion, was an insult to the House, and it was humiliating to any of His Majesty's Ministers to have to come down to the House of Commons and make such a statement as that in reply to a question. The order giving the instructions he had referred to in regard to these lightships in Ireland was issued in the year 1852, or about the time of Noah's Ark. Here was an order issued all those years ago, and it was still being imposed upon them. What steps was Parliament going to take in this matter? The President of the Board of Trade had told them that he was going to follow in the footsteps of former Presidents of the Board of Trade. Some time ago when the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Bristol was President of the Board of Trade he, the hon. Member, brought forward, in Committee, a Motion on the very subject that was now before the House. At that time he was informed that the Board of Trade had really no control over the matter, and was told to apply to the Commissioners of Irish Lights. He was bandied about from pillar to post in that way, and he did not know which authority to appeal to. All he knew was that the money had gone somewhere, and as far as the administration of Irish piers and lighthouses were concerned, it was very difficult to run any Minister into a corner in regard to their responsibility. He was now told that the President of the Board of Trade had control, but he had no hesitation in telling him that he had nothing of the kind. The only way for the Board of Trade to get proper control was to accept this Bill, which would place the control directly under Parliament and then Parliament would have to raise the money. They had no right to take money from the shipowners without giving them control in the spending of it.

He wished to say a few words upon the subject of telegraphic communication between the lighthouses, and he would show the House how backward the Board of Trade were in coming forward. There had been a long controversy on the subject of gas, and there had been a great deal of "gas" in this House which was always directed against the adoption of any new invention. The Colonies were adopting the Marconi system of telegraphy and he would like the President of the Board of Trade to tell the House how long it would be before he adopted that system in connection with the lighthouses, and if he did adopt it who was going to pay for it. The Government of this country were always the last people in the world to take up any new invention. Under the present system British shipping had to pay nearly all the cost of lighthouses, and foreign shippers got off almost scot-free. As regarded the Bill itself, its object was not to get money out of the pockets of the British taxpayer but to transfer the management of the lighthouses and the responsibility for the same to the Board of Trade, in order that Members of Parliament might go for the President of the Board of Trade when the work was not properly done. A proposal of that kind ought to be readily supported by three-quarters of the Members of the House of Commons. The sum of £500,000 was raised annually by the light dues, and the mercantile marine paid the whole of it, while the Navy, which was absolutely dependent for its safety upon those lights paid nothing whatsoever towards the cost of the upkeep of the lighthouses. The sum of £60,000 or £70,000 a year could be saved by coming to terms with America. It would be a great thing for this country to have a closer union with the United States in that way. If the object of this Bill had been a protective one, as had been hinted by the late Chancellor of the Exchequer, he could quite understand them objecting to it, but it was not. Under this Bill the transfer of the administration would certainly bring down the cost of the lights in Ireland. For these reasons he thought it was the duty of hon. Members to vote for the Second Reading of this measure.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E): I do not intend to detain the House very long upon this question. I am sometimes twitted with holding peculiar views in regard to the functions of my office which are not shared by any of my predecessors, but it may be a consolation to the hon. Member for Liverpool to know that on this subject I am in perfect agreement with my predecessors. The Bill deals with two distinct subjects; the first is the question of what is to be the nature of the administrative authority which is responsible for the lighting of our coasts, and the second is as to who is to provide the funds which are required to maintain that lighting. No one can help being struck by the testimony from almost every speaker as to the zeal, and, on the whole, the success, with which the present administrative authority has discharged its duty. Of course hon. Members in their anxiety to make out a case for a change have emphasised whatever grounds of complaint there might be, and they have criticised as freely as possible the acts of omission or of commission in regard to the existing lighthouse authorities. Nobody who has read the literature issued in support of this, and who compares it with the speeches delivered in this House by the promoters of this measure can help being struck by the very different tone adopted by speakers here, and by the tribute of praise which they have extended to those who are now responsible fot the administration of our lighthouses. So far as the criticism relates to the composition, it is perfectly plain that if we were for the first time creating a lighthouse authority in this country we should not construct boards exactly like Trinity House or the Commissioners of Northern Lights or the Irish Lighthouse Board. It would be easy to find theoretical fault with the method by which they are constituted; but it has been admitted on all hands that, so far as their practical work is concerned, they have devoted care and attention to it, and that on the whole the results shown on our coasts are very creditable.

Then there was some criticism of the way in which they discharge their functions, but that criticism is of a contradictory kind. It is said they are extravagant and spend too much, and some hon. Members have said that what they are doing is inadequate, and that there cannot be proper or enough lights so long as the present authorities are allowed to retain their control. I have listened to nearly the whole of the speeches made upon this Bill, and I think I may safely say that in the whole course of this debate, although there has been general charges of extravagance, not a single specific instance of money wasted has been brought to the notice of the House. The Member for Islington alluded to one bargain which Trinity House had made, and which my hon. friend thought was a very improvident bargain—namely, that relating to the provision of a lightship for the new Admiralty works at Dover. I made that bargain when I was at the Board of Admiralty and I confess to the House that I do not think I ever made a worse bargain during the five years I was at the office. If the Trinity House never made a worse bargain for themselves than they made on that occasion with the Admiralty, they must do a very prosperous business. They obtained for the upkeep of the light a sum which I thought at the time, and which I now know, was in excess of what it cost. They safeguarded themselves by providing that this sum was not to include the cost of repairing any damage or loss occasioned by any extraordinary casualty or collision, the cost of repairing which cannot be recovered by any claim for salvage service, such expenses being an additional charge upon the Admiralty; and in the case of tota loss the Admiralty were to pay Trinity House a sum in replacement of the vessel based on valuation as might be agreed upon. This light vessel has been twice run down and lost, and they have recovered full value from the ships responsible for the destruction. They have equipped themselves with two perfectly new vessels in place of the old ones at a net cost, I think, of some £5,000, of which £2,000 or £3,000 has been paid by the charge they made to the Admiralty for up-keep over and above the cost. I made the bargain on behalf of the Admiralty, and it was the best I could make, although I have to admit the Trinity House overpowered me in that case. It is the worst and only specific charge of extravagance or improvidence which has been brought, and I do not think there is much fault to be found on that score. Suppose there was, what is the remedy proposed by the Bill? It is to transfer power to the Board of Trade; but in the matter of extravagance the Board of Trade has now full and absolute responsibility, and has absolute power to prevent extravagance.

There seems to be a good deal of misapprehension as to the authority of the Board of Trade over the expenditure of the lighthouse authorities. All the estimates of expenditure have to be submitted annually for approval by the Board of Trade. These estimates, with all the details of the number of officers and men employed, their rates of pay and allowances, the expenditure for coal, fuel, and repairs, office expenses, law charges, expenditure proposed on experiments, the removal of wrecks, superannuation contracts for works, and other supplies have all to be submitted for the approval of the Board of Trade. Over all the expenditure that takes places the control of the Board of Trade is absolute, its power only ceasing when it is a question of initiating a new lighthouse. The Board of Trade has no power to direct that new lighthouses shall be built, or as to their position, but they have absolute control over all expenditure proposed to be incurred by the various lighthouse authorities, and they have power to suggest any improvements they may think desirable, or which the advisory committee think is desirable. They can bring the advisory committee and the authorities together to discuss the programme of works. It is not too much to say that representations made by the Board of Trade to any of these lighthouse boards always receive the attention which they obviously demand. I do not really think that in the course of this debate, and I have listened to it carefully, any case has been made out for the transfer of the powers now exercised by the various lighthouse authorities to the Board of Trade on the ground of mismanagement or inefficiency.

I think that is the state of the case as to the administrative proposals of the Bill. As to the other part of the Bill—which, of course, is out of order—which would transfer the charge for the maintenance of these lights to the Exchequer, I should like to ask any hon. Gentleman representing the shipping interest—where do you believe this charge falls at the present time? Various suggestions have been made, and some of them are somewhat contradictory. Some hon. Members contradicted themselves in the course of their own speeches. The hon. Member who seconded the Motion for the Second Reading of this Bill said that the shipowner did not bear this charge. He went on to say that it was an impost on our foreign trade, import and export. If that is so, how much better would you be off by passing the charge through the Exchequer? If that description of the charge be true, by transferring it to the Exchequer you do not alter the incidence. If the incidence be as the hon. Member said, what does this tax amount to? Is it really such a sum as to deserve the strictures hon. Members have passed upon it as a great impediment to trade? It is something less than 1s. 6d. in the £100 of trade on which it is said to fall. Does anyone suggest that the prosperity of this trade is going to be affected by a charge of that kind? And if it be true that the country ought to bear the charge, how could the whole community bear it better than evenly distributed in this way? [AN HON. MEMBER: Does it fall on the consumer?] The hon. Member for Gloucester said it did, but some of my friends do not agree to that, and I only mention it by way of illustration to make my task somewhat easy. I have dealt with the theory of the hon. Member for Gloucester; I will deal with the theory of hon. Members who suggest that the charge falls on the shipowner. I do not think that it is an unfair charge for the shipowner to bear. Hon. Gentlemen have drawn an analogy between this charge and the contribution the State makes in lieu of rates for Government property. I do not think that the analogy can hold good for a moment. That contribution is made because the State there steps in and occupies property which would be otherwise rateable. The local community is deprived of the rating which but for the State it would obtain. That is not the case with these shipping dues at all, nor do I think our practice in regard to rating affords any analogy to these dues.

Hon. Members say that if the contributions are to be levied in the form of light dues, as at present, it is very unfair that the Navy should not be treated as a contributor. The Navy is, of course, of great importance to every individual and interest in this country, but no interest is so much and so directly interested in it as our mercantile marine. Anyone who studies the returns made as to the relative cost of the navies of the world by the Admiralty will see how much additional cost for our Navy is imposed upon us by the necessity of protecting our trade all the world over, and how much we would save if we had only to consider the protection of our coasts. To say that the State which provides this protection should also pay these light dues every time a ship of the Navy passes into a British port seems to me a most unjust and unreasonable claim to make, and one which, if I may say so, I think the shipowners and those interested would be unwise to press.

A good deal has been said as to the practice of other nations. I think some of the statements made have not been quite accurate, and many of the inferences drawn from them have been misleading. It is not true that Turkey is the only country besides ourselves which raises the money for lighting the coasts in this way. Sweden and Norway both raise the charge from the same quarter. But do hon. Gentlemen who quote foreign example desire us to follow foreign practice, and are they prepared to institute tonnage dues such as are imposed by foreign countries and out of which the expenses of lighting are borne? If they are in favour of that it might a good deal modify any opposition which comes from the Chancellor of the Exchequer because, after all, the effect on the Treasury would not then be serious. It would only be a case of raising the money from the same people in a slightly different way, but if they are not in favour of the adoption of that course, then I say that their frequent reference to Continental practice is misleading, and that they cannot base their case on what goes on in foreign countries. I say frankly that on the merits of the case I do not share the views of hon. Gentlemen who think that light dues ought to be abolished, but even if I did would anyone suggest that the present is the moment for the transfer of this charge to the Exchequer? My right hon. friend the Member for West Bristol a few moments ago called the attention of the House to the way in which we were to be occupied on Monday. I suppose that I shall sit here to be pointed at as a horrible example of extravagance and as the oppressor of the taxpayer. Here am I struggling, I know not whether successfully or not, to protect the taxpayer on this occasion. How many of the Gentlemen who are going to vote against us on Monday or Tuesday are going to give me assistance now, not to reduce expenditure, but to prevent its being raised?

Mr. DAVID MACIVER (Liverpool, Kirkdale) said the opposition to this Bill was largely based on a misconception. The effect of our present system was to protect foreign ports in their competition with British ports, the latter being handicapped to the extent of the light dues. He also contended that the practice of placing the cost of lights on the locality was detrimental to safe navigation; and that places where lighthouses were urgently needed remained without any such provision. He called attention to the particular case of the rocks on the coast of Guernsey, where there had been sixteen disasters in the last twenty-two years. That was only one of many instances he could name if time permitted. But the collection of light dues was not altogether indefensible. The one redeeming feature about them was that the foreigner was now paying a large and rapidly increasing part of them. The reason, however, was not very gratifying to our national vanity. At our southern ports German steamers of large tonnage, created under protection, took away the business which ought to be ours.

Mr. MALCOLM (Suffolk, Stowmarket), who spoke amid cries of "Divide," said that as he was not identified with the Board of Trade, the Treasury, or the shipping interest he thought he had a right to say a word against this Bill. There were many who could not agree with the hon. Member for King's Lynn in finding fault with the agricultural Members for sending out a communication asking hon. Members to oppose the Bill in order that additional taxation should not fall on the agricultural industry. The hon. Member for King's Lynn pointed out that certain reductions of rates had been granted to the agricultural interest, and complained of their ungraciousness in opposing the measure now before the House. But the hon. Member forgot how much harm the agricultural interest had suffered from the carrying trade of this country, which brought corn from abroad to compete with that which was produced here. In the last five or six weeks private Members, either by Bills or Resolutions, had tried to increase the annual expenditure of the country by £10,000,000. The present Bill, which would put £400,000 on the British taxpayers, was one of the examples he had before him in making that calculation. He objected to the Bill also on the ground that it would lead to an increase in the staff of permanent officials, with whom he was bound to say he was not very much enamoured, and against whom hon. Members on both sides of the House were constantly inveighing. He testified to the excellent work done by the Northern Lights Commissioners, whom he described as well-known gentlemen of honesty and probity. The lighting of the Scotch coast was certainly not everything that could be desired, but the deficiencies were being met very rapidly. If hon. Gentlemen wanted those deficiencies to be absolutely overcome, they would do better to apply to that purpose the money which would be required for the payment of a new staff of officials if this Bill were passed.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 155; Noes, 129. (Division List No. 124.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Arrol, Sir William
Atherley-Jones, L.
Austin, Sir John
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth, C. B.
Bignold, Arthur
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Bond, Edward
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Brigg, John
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Burt, Thomas
Caldwell, James
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Glasgow
Causton, Richard Knight
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Charrington, Spencer
Colomb, Rt. Hon. Sir John C.R.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Craig, Robert Hunter (Lanark)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Cust, Henry John C.
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Denny, Colonel
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Doughty, George
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Duke, Henry Edward
Duncan, J. Hastings
Elibank, Master of
Emmott, Alfred
Evans, Sir Francis H. (Maidstone
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Freeman-Thomas, Captain F.
Garfit, William
Hain, Edward
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nderry
Harrington, Timothy
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th)
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Helder, Agustus
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Henderson, Sir A. (Stafford, W.
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Hoult, Joseph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Joicey, Sir James
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Joyce, Michael
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Lawrence, Sir Joseph (Monm'th)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Leng, Sir John
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, David
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lough, Thomas
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)
Lundon, W.
Macdona, John Cumming
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Calmont, Colonel John
M'Crae, George
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
M'Laren, Sir Charles Benjamin
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Milvain, Thomas
Mitchell, Edw. (Fermanagh, N.
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Moore, William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Nannetti, Joseph P.
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Malley, William
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Philipps, John Wynford
Pierpoint, Robert
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Pym, C. Guy
Randles, John S.
Rankin, Sir James
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renwick, George
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robson, William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rose, Charles Day
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. Edw. J.
Seely, Maj. J. E. B (Isle of Wight
Seton-Karr, Sir Henry
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Sheehy, David
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Slack, John Bamford
Sloan, Thomas Henry

Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R(Northants
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Harold John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr)
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. H(Sheffield
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Wallace, Robert
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Woodhouse, Sir J. T(Huddersf'd
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Wyndham-Quin, Col. W. H.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Plummer and Mr. Russell Rea

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Allsopp, Hon. George
Ambrose, Robert
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Balfour, Rt Hn. Gerald W. (Leeds
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bartley, Sir George C. T.
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Michael Hicks
Boland, John
Bull, William James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Cautley, Henry Strother
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A. (Worc.
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Clive, Captain Percy A.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Coddington, Sir William
Cogan, Denis J.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cullinan, J.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Davenport, William Bromley
Delany, William
Devlin, Charles Ramsay (Galway
Devlin, Joseph (Kilkenny, N.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dickson, Charles Scott
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Dunn, Sir William
Edwards, Frank
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Flower, Sir Ernest
Flynn, James Christopher
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Gardner, Ernest
Gretton, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Gunter, Sir Robert
Hammond, John
Hayden, John Patrick
Heath, James (Staffords, N.W.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Hoare, Sir Samuel
Hobhouse, Rt. Hn H(Somers't, E
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Howard, John (Kent, Faversham
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Hunt, Rowland
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jordan, Jeremiah
Kearley, Hudson, E.
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Kilbride, Denis
Lambert, George
Law, Andrew Bonar (Glasgow)
Lawson, John Grant (Yorks. N. R
Leamy, Edmund
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
MacVeagh, Jeremiah
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
Maxwell, Rt Hn. Sir H. E. (Wigt'n
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Milner, Rt. Hon. Sir Frederick G.
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants.)
Morton, Arthur H. Aylmer
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Murphy, John
Murray, Rt Hn. A. Graham (Bute
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid.
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Power, Patrick Joseph
Pretyman, Ernest George
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Renshaw, Sir Charles Bine
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. Thomson
Roberts, Samuel (Sheffield)
Roche, John
Round, Rt. Hon. James
Scott, Sir S (Marylebone, W.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Spencer, Sir E. (W. Bromwich)
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset)
Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord (Lancs.)
Stevenson, Francis S.
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Sullivan, Donal
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Thornton, Percy M.
Tollemache, Henry James
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Welby, Lt.-Col. A C. E. (Taunton
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Wharton and Mr. Malcolm.

Bill accordingly read a second time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be committed to the Standing Committee on Trade, &c."—(*Mr. Plummer.*)

And, it being after half-past Five of the Clock, and objection being taken to Further Proceeding, the Debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed upon Friday, 3rd June.

Adjourned at twenty-four minutes before Six o'clock till Monday next.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Monday, 16th May, 1904.

SAT FIRST.

The Earl of Chichester sat first in Parliament after the death of his brother.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with:—Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 1).

Also the Certificate that no Standing Orders are applicable to the following Bill:—Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 3).

Also the Certificates that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with:—Barnet District Gas and Water; Crystal Palace District Gas.

And also the Certificate that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have not been complied with:—Tottenham Improvement.

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

Filey Improvement Bill [H.L.]. Reported, with Amendments.

Great Western Railway Bill [H.L.]. The King's consent signified; and Bill reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

St. Marylebone Electric Lighting Bill. Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

Manchester Corporation Tramways Bill [H.L.]. A witness ordered to attend the Select Committee.

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill. Read 2^{a}, and committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

Portmadoc, Beddgelert, and South Snowdon Railway Bill [H.L.]. Read 3^{a}. Amendments made. Bill passed, and sent to the Commons.

Preston Corporation Water Bill [H.L.]; Bournemouth Corporation (Tramways) Bill [H.L.]; Newcastle-upon-Tyne Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Alexandra (Newport and South Wales) Docks and Railway Bill [H.L.]; St. Mary Woolnoth Bill [H.L.]. Read 3^{a}, and passed, and sent to the Commons.

Croydon Gas Bill. Read 3^{a}, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

Canal Rates and Charges (Regents Canal) Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill [H.L.]. To be read 2^{a} To-morrow.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill. Brought from the Commons; read 1^{a}; to be printed; and referred to the Examiners. (No. 78.)

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill [H.L.]. House in Committee (according to order). An Amendment made. Standing Committee negatived. The Report of Amendment to be received To-morrow.

Educational Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill [H.L.]. Read 3^{a} (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons.

Manchester Corporation (General Powers) Bill [H.L.]; Manchester Corporation Tramways Bill [H.L.]. The order made on Tuesday the 26th of April last appointing certain Lords the Select Committee to consider the Bills, discharged.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE.

Annual Statement of the Trade of the United Kingdom with Foreign Countries and British Possessions, 1903, compared with the four preceding years: Volume II. (Abstract and detailed tables of trade with each country and at each port). Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

MEDWAY CONSERVANCY.

Statement of Receipts and Expenditure by the Conservators, for the year ended 25th March, 1904. Delivered (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

———

NEW BILL.

——

RE-VACCINATION BILL [H.L.].

A Bill to provide for the Re-vaccination of children after the age of twelve—Was presented by the Duke of Northumberland; read 1^a; and to be printed. (No. 77.)

———

PRIZE COURTS BILL [H.L.].

House in Committee (according to order). Bill reported without amendment, and re-committed to the Standing Committee.

———

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES (METRIC SYSTEM) BILL [H.L.].

Amendments reported (according to order.)

LORD BELHAVEN AND STENTON: My Lords, there are additional Amendments in my name which I should like to say a few words upon. The Bill as reprinted is in accordance with the Amendments which were put before us by the Board of Trade. The Home Office, however, did not entirely approve of the Bill in that form and they made some Amendments thereon. The Amendments I now move are those which have been agreed to by the Home Office and the Board of Trade together, in conjunction with the Parliamentary draftsman.

Amendments moved—

> "In Clause 3, page 2, line 15, to leave out the words 'be deemed to'; in line 18, to leave out the words 'if not so made shall be void and'; in line 20, after the word 'system' to insert the words 'and if any person makes or has any contract, bargain, sale, or dealing, or charges or collects any toll or duty contrary to the provisions of this section, he shall, on conviction under the Summary Jurisdiction Acts, be liable for each offence to a fine not exceeding 40s.'; in line 24, to leave out the words 'render void' and to insert the words 'apply to'; and in line 25, to leave out from the word 'Kingdom' to the word 'or' in line 28, and to insert the words 'or in respect of any subject-matter outside the United Kingdom, or of any goods to be imported into or exported from the United Kingdom, if made or had according to the system of weights and measures in force in the foreign country concerned."—(*Lord Belhaven and Stenton.*)

On Question, Amendments agreed to. Bill to be read 3^a To-morrow; and to be printed as amended. (No. 79.)

House adjourned at twenty minutes before Five o'clock, till To-morrow, half past Ten o'clock.

———

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 16*th May*, 1904.

——

The House met at Two of the Clock.

———

UNOPPOSED PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

——

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).

MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz.:—Marylebone Chapels (Saint James, Westmoreland Street) Bill [Lords]; Minehead Urban District Council Water Bill [Lords]; West Riding Tramways Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS (NO STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE).

MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, referred on the First Reading thereof, no Standing Orders are applicable, viz.:—Land Drainage Provisional Order (Owston and West Butterwick, in county of Lincoln (Parts of Lindsey) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill; Local

Government Provisional Orders (No. 12) Bill.

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time To-morrow.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz.:—Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 13) Bill.

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time To-morrow.

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway (Various Powers) Bill (King's Consent signified). Bill read the third time, and passed.

Harlow and Sawbridgeworth Gas Bill [Lords]; Nuneaton and Chilvers Coton Urban District Council Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

Chesterfield Gas and Water Board Bill [Lords]; Harrogate Waterworks Tramroad Bill [Lords]. Read a second time, and committed.

Leeds Corporation (Waterworks) Railway Bill [Lords]; Llanelly Harbour Bill [Lords]. Read a second time, and committed.

Metropolitan District Railway Bill [Lords]; Neath, Pontardawe, and Brynaman Railway Bill [Lords]; Shipley Urban District Council Bill [Lords]; South Staffordshire Mines Drainage Bill [Lords]. Read a second time, and committed.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill. Read a second time, and committed.

Local Government Provisional Order (No. 15). Bill to confirm a Provisional Order of the Local Government Board relating to Cardiff, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Grant Lawson and Mr. Walter Long.

Local Government Provisional Order (No. 15) Bill. "To confirm a Provisional Order of the Local Government Board relating to Cardiff," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 196.]

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—Metropolitan Police Provisional Order Bill without Amendment.

Whitby Gas Bill; Blyth and Cowpen Gas Bill, with Amendments.

PETITIONS.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions against; from Lindal in Furness; Milnathort; Partick; Kirkby Muxloe; Westerhan; New Bury; Farnworth (four); Rinley; Derby; West Bromwich; Kincardine; Edinburgh (two); Warrington; North Shields; Glasgow (five); North Berwick; Cornsay; Esk; Beamish; Blackhill; Hamsteels; Langley Park; Bathgate; Sheffield (two); Wroughton Road; Lewes; Glastonbury; Liverpool; Cornsay Colliery; Langley Moor; Waterhouses; Beith; Hammersmith; Oxford; Bath; Bearpark; Gourock; Inverness; East Somerset; Holsworthy; Bainbridge; Stanwick; Northampton; Gowerton; Caersalem Newydd; Wannacewydd; Gurnos; Ynysmendw; Ystalyfera; Brynamman; Rotherham (two); Newcastle on Tyne; Hamilton; Marley Hill; Galashiels; Holloway; Alva; Eccles; Alloa; Milnathort; Southend; Newport; Wellington; Mere; Birstall; Reading; Thetford; Falmouth; Penryn; Paisley; Todmoden; Fraserburgh; Thornhill; Kirkpatrick Fleming (two); Kettering; Tiverton; Cranbourne; Dundee (four); Penrith; Malmesbury; Chippenham; Rye; Egremont; Sawtry; Caythorpe; Locharbriggs; Kinloch Laggan; Treboeth; Landore; Aberdeen; Canning Town; Burnley; Paisley; and Parkgate; to lie upon the table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

LOCAL AUTHORITIES IN SCOTLAND (TECHNICAL EDUCATION).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 26th June, 1903; *The Lord Advocate*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 117.]

EASTERN MAIL SERVICE COMMITTEE.

Copy presented, of Report of the Eastern Mail Service Committee, 1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE (FOREIGN COUNTRIES AND BRITISH POSSESSIONS).

Copy presented, of Annual Statement of the Trade of the United Kingdom with Foreign Countries and British Possessions for 1903. Volume II. [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PATENTS, DESIGNS, AND TRADE MARKS.

Copy presented, of Twenty-first Report of the Comptroller-General of Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks, with Appendices, for the year 1903 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 178.]

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

Medway Conservancy. Copy of Statement of Receipts and Expenditure of the Conservators for the year ending 25th March, 1904 [by Act].

ALLOTMENTS (SCOTLAND).

Return ordered, "showing (1) the Proceedings of Parish Councils in regard to Allotments and Common Pasture under Section 26 of The Local Government (Scotland) Act, 1894; and (2) the Proceedings of County Councils in regard to representations by Parish Councils for Orders under The Local Government (Scotland) Act, 1894, Section 26, authorising land to be taken on lease compulsorily for Allotments since the date of the last Return on the 15th day of July last (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 257, of Session 1903)."—(*Mr. Eugene Wason.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Water Suppy of Erbusaig School.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Secretary for Scotland whether he is aware that the sanitary inspector for Ross and Cromarty reports that the water supply of Erbusaig School is unsatisfactory; and will he consider the expediency of taking such steps as may be necessary to have this defect remedied.

(*Answered by Mr. A. Graham Murray.*) I have made inquiries on the point raised by the hon. Member, and am informed by the Local Government Board that the water supply for Erbusaig School is at present ample.

Construction of Harbour at Avoch, Ross-shire—Government Grant.

MR. WEIR: To ask the Secretary for Scotland whether he is now in a position to state what sum it is proposed to grant in aid of the construction of a harbour at Avoch, Ross-shire.

(*Answered by Mr. A. Graham Murray.*) I am informed that the Harbour Trustees have applied to the Treasury for a grant, and I am unable at present to give the hon. Member any further information.

Publication of Report of Fishery Board for Scotland.

MR. WEIR: To ask the Secretary for Scotland if he will state when the Report of the Fishery Board for Scotland will be in the hands of Members.

(*Answered by Mr. A. Graham Murray.*) The Report of the Fishery Board for Scotland (Part I.) is in the hands of the printers, and will, I understand, be circulated in the course of the next few days.

Refusal to Read Burial Service by Vicar of Little Canfield, Essex.

MR. J. A. PEASE (Essex, Saffron Walden): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that the Rev. W. H. Hills, the rector of Little Canfield, Essex, recently refused to read the appointed burial service of the Church of England on the burial of Mrs. Morton, a parishioner, on the ground that, although a churchwoman, she was not a communicant, he at the same time expressing his willingness to read an alternative service, and that, in consequence of such refusal the gravedigger refused to dig the grave, and the services of a gravedigger of another parish had to be secured, and the service had to be read by a Nonconformist minister; and, if so, whether any steps will be taken to prevent a recurrence of such an incident.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) I have made inquiries into this case. It does not appear that it is one in which I have any jurisdiction, and I understand that the matter is before the Bishop of the diocese. In these circumstances I do not propose to discuss the facts of the case or how far they are exactly represented by the terms of the Question.

Proposal of the Standing Committee of the Baronetage.

SIR JOHN DORINGTON (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he has considered the proposal made to him in a letter from the Standing Council of the Baronetage, dated 3rd February last, that a special body or Commission should be appointed to inquire into and report on the questions respecting which he had asked for information, and any other questions connected therewith; and, if so, will he state what action he proposes to take in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Akers-Douglas.*) I have duly considered the proposal to which my hon. friend refers, but I doubt whether the question at issue calls for the appointment of a Commission of inquiry such as is suggested. I am not in a position to state the advice which I shall have to give His Majesty the King as to the possibility of providing a remedy for the alleged wrongful assumption of baronetcies. I can only say that I have not yet seen any suitable proposal for an effectual remedy, and it may be feared that the remedy, if any, is by legislation.

Insanitary Condition of the River Ray.

SIR F. DIXON-HARTLAND (Middlesex, Uxbridge): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether his attention has been called to the insanitary condition of the River Ray, a stream running between the town of Swindon and the Thames; and whether he will bring pressure to bear on the authorities concerned to undertake the duty of cleansing the stream, which does not come within the scope of the Thames Conservators' powers.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) My attention has been drawn to this subject. I have no power to require the local authorities to undertake the cleansing of the stream, but I am communicating with them on the subject.

Nursing of Sick Poor in Workhouses—Recommendations of Committee.

SIR HARRY SAMUEL (Tower Hamlets, Limehouse): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether the Local Government Board has decided to issue a general Order consequent upon the recommendations contained in the Report of the Departmental Committee upon the nursing of the sick poor in workhouses; if so, when such Order will be issued and, before such issue, for what Parliamentary period will the order be laid upon the Table of the House of Commons for its consideration.

(*Answered by Mr. Walter Long.*) This matter is receiving my attention with a view to the issue of an Order as early as practicable. It will not be necessary, however, that the Order should be laid upon the Table of the House prior to its issue.

Postal Facilities at Leamyglissane and Cummeen.

MR. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he will consider the advisability of improving the postal delivery at Leamyglissane, near Gneeveguilla, county Kerry, and making it a daily delivery; and also of improving the delivery at Cummeen, near Killarney, so as to make it the same as the delivery on the adjoining townlands.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) Inquiries are being made on the question of improving the postal service at Leamyglissane, near Gneeveguilla, and also at Cummeen, near Killarney. The result shall be communicated to the hon. Member in due course.

Extension of Trunk Telephone System to Tralee.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he has received resolutions from the Kerry County Council and Tralee Urban Council, asking to extend the trunk telephone system to Tralee; and whether, as Tralee is one of the most important business towns in the South of Ireland, he will consider those applications.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) I have received the resolutions referred to by the hon. Member, and local inquiry is at present being made as to the amount of support likely to be given if an extension of the trunk system to county Kerry were carried out. Tralee is in the same local exchange area as Killarney, and the best means of serving the area would be by a trunk line between Mallow and Killarney. It would rest with the National Telephone Company, who have an exchange at Tralee, to connect that exchange with the trunk exchange at Killarney. The cost of the trunk line between Mallow and Killarney would be considerable, and I shall be glad of any information as to those from whom I may hope to receive support.

Delays in London and Brighton Telephone Service.

MR. LODER (Brighton): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware of the constant delays in transmitting telephone messages between London and Brighton; and whether he will take steps to arrange for a more efficient service.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) The telephone traffic between London and Brighton is subject, occasionally, to delay owing to some exceptional difficulties in the maintenance of the lines as well as to the amount of the traffic. Steps are being taken to provide additional lines, which will, I hope, prevent these delays.

Cork Post Office—Qualifications of Officer selected as Clerk.

MR. J. F. X. O'BRIEN (Cork): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he will state, in view of the recent indoor revision at Cork, what are the postal qualifications of the officer selected for the position of clerk, and whether, seeing that this position of clerk is redundant, and provided to meet the annual and sick leaves of the other clerks and assistant superintendents in the sorting office, he will state how often the officer selected has performed superior duties in the sorting office, how often has he performed sorting clerk's and telegraphist's duties there; and whether he is aware that these duties are being performed for the greater part of the year by most of the officers who have been passed over, while they have never been performed by the officer selected.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) The officer in question is fully qualified for the postal duties which he has to perform, and was the best qualified of the eligible candidates. I fully considered the claims and qualifications of all the officers standing above him on the class of sorting clerks and telegraphists. The superior duties to which the hon. Member refers are, it is presumed, those performed by the senior sorting clerks and telegraphists who act as substitutes for clerks absent on leave. The officer promoted did not perform these duties, though he was fully competent to do so, having been detached for others of a more important and responsible character. He has performed the ordinary duties of a sorting clerk and telegraphist for about six years. I do not think any useful object would be gained by discussing in this House the details of the duties which he has hitherto performed or the precise nature of his qualifications.

MR. J. F. X. O'BRIEN: To ask the Postmaster-General whether he will take steps to see that the officer promoted to the position of clerk (new appointment), sanctioned under the indoor revision at Cork, fulfils the terms of his appointment and takes up the duty of the redundant clerk—viz., relieving other clerks and assistant superintendents on sick and annual leave; and, seeing that he is now the junior officer of his class, he will not be allowed to retain the duties of postmaster's writing clerk, as this duty can be provided for by senior officers on the class of clerks.

(*Answered by Lord Stanley.*) It is true that an additional appointment was created because an officer of the rank of clerk was required to act as substitute for officers of higher rank absent on leave or from other causes. But it would not be in accordance with the ordinary rule of the service to select the junior clerk to act as substitute on the higher class. A senior clerk would be selected, and the junior clerk will be employed on any duties for which he may be best qualified The officer selected to act as postmaster's writing clerk will be the one best qualified for the duties to be performed.

The British and German Navies.

Mr. YERBURGH (Chester): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he will state what were the numbers of battleships, cruisers, sloops, gunboats, and destroyers building in Great Britain on 10th March, 1894, when the Liberal Government announced their new programme of seven battleships, six cruisers, and two sloops, and what were the numbers of the various classes of the aforesaid ships building on 1st February, 1904, when the present Government announced their programme of two battleships, four cruisers, and fourteen destroyers; and can he state the numbers of the various classes of the aforesaid ships building in Germany on or about the said dates of the 10th March, 1894 and the 2nd February, 1904.

(*Answered by Mr. Pretyman.*) The numbers of battleships, cruisers, etc. building in Great Britain and Germany on the dates named were as follows:—

	10th March, 1894.		1st February, 1904.	
	Great Britain.	Germany.	Great Britain.	Germany.
Battleships . .	3	6	13	
Cruisers . . .	5	2	22	7
Sloops . . .	2	0	2	0
Gunboats . . .	2	0	0	1
Destroyers . .	36	1†	31	6

German Battleship Building Programme.

Sir JOHN COLOMB (Great Yarmouth): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether his attention has been called to the fact that the German Navy Bill of 12th June, 1900, provided for laying down two battleships in 1904, two in 1905, and two in 1906; and, if so, can he say whether this programme is being carried out according to its provisions, or whether the building of these battleships has been accelerated.

(*Answered by Mr. Pretyman.*) The German programme of 1900 allowed for two battleships each year from 1901 to 1909 inclusive. Up to the present this programme has been adhered to, and has not been accelerated in any way.

Railway Carriage on Grain, Potatoes etc., in Scotland.

Mr. BUCHANAN (Perthshire, E.): To ask the hon. Member for North Huntingdonshire, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, what reply has been obtained from the railway companies to the representations of the Board that were based on a memorial from the County Council of Perth, on the inequalities of the rates for grain, potatoes, etc., between stations in Scotland, and on the high charges for the carriage of fruit from Blairgowrie to England as compared with the cost of carrying fruit to the same towns from the Continent.

---

† Divisional Boat of about 300 tons.

(*Answered by Mr. Ailwyn Fellowes.*) On receipt of the memorial to which the hon. Member refers, detailed inquiry was instituted and an interim report was sent to the county council for their observations in January, 1903. The inquiry has since been continued, but it was found practically impossible to confine it to the actual cases against which complaint was made, and a Departmental Committee has now been appointed to investigate generally the alleged preferential treatment of foreign and colonial as compared with British produce. The specific complaints made by the Perthshire County Council will be brought before that Committee.

Position of Clerks to Surveyors of Taxes.

MR. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, in view of the Instruction to the Income-Tax Committee, which covers the system of repayment of overpaid income-tax, and as such overpayments in surveyors' offices are regulated by the clerical staff under the supervision of the surveyor, he will, under the circumstances, further instruct the Committee to inquire into the position of surveyors' clerks, in order that provision may be made for their establishment as permanent civil servants, or such other steps taken as will guarantee them security in their profession, and a prospect of maintenance as they become unfit for further service.

(*Answered by Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*) No such question could possibly come within the scope of the present inquiry.

Re-organisation of Indian Army—Lord Kitchener's Memorandum.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): To ask the Secretary of State for India if he will lay upon the Table a copy of Lord Kitchener's recent Memorandum concerning the organisation of the Army in India, and particularly that portion relating to the duty of every European to serve in the Volunteer force.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) I will lay a copy of the Memorandum on the Table.

Estimated Increased Annual Cost of Indian Police Service.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether he will be in a position to state, at an early date, the estimated increased annual cost of the Indian police service involved in the adoption of the recommendation of the Police Commission now under the consideration of the Council of India.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*) As I have already stated on more than one occasion in reply to Questions in this House, I am unable to make any statement in regard to the measures to be taken upon the recommendations of the Police Commission until I receive the opinion upon them of the Government of India, under whose consideration (and not that of the Council of India) they now are. I have urged expedition in dealing with the Report of the Commission, but I cannot say when I shall receive the views of the Government of India upon it.

Teachers as Secretaries to School Attendance Committees.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether there is any rule of the Irish National Board preventing a teacher from acting as secretary to a school attendance committee; and, if so, what is that rule; and will he explain why a teacher is debarred from the discharge of purely secretarial work of this kind.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) Under Rule 180 (*a*) "Teachers of national schools are not permitted to carry on, or engage in any business or occupation that will impair their usefulness as teachers." It has been decided that the position of secretary to a school attendance committee comes within the rule.

Clerks in Irish County Surveyor's and County Secretary's Offices.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, where county councils in Ireland made new permanent appointments such as clerks in the county surveyor's and county secretary's offices under Section 83 (*b*) of the Local Government Act of 1898, such officers become entitled to superannuation after certain service; and, if so, will he state the minimum period they are required to serve before they become pensionable officers; and whether such officers can be dismissed at any time during their service by county councils without assigning any cause and without the sanction of the Local Government Board.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) Section 83 (11) applies the provisions of the Union Officers' Superannuation Acts to officers of county councils (other than the county surveyor). Under these enactments a county council may, with the consent of the Local Government Board, grant a pension not exceeding two-thirds of his salary and emoluments to a clerk in the county surveyor's or in the secretary's office on his ceasing to hold office, provided (*a*) he has devoted his whole time to the service of the county, and (*b*) that he becomes incapacitated for service on the ground of old age or permanent infirmity of mind or body. An officer can only be pensioned on ground of old age if he has attained the age of sixty years, and has served as a county officer for twenty years at the least. The clerks referred to are not entitled as of right to receive pensions, and they can be appointed and removed without the sanction of the Local Government Board.

Irish Land Commission

Mr. FLYNN (Cork, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the fact that Mr. George Bolster, of Glenmount, Kanturk, county Cork, is a member of the Land Commission operating in Cork County, and that he deals with the land cases coming from a district in which he has personal interests, he will state if this is in accordance with the regulations and practice of the Land Commissioners.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) Mr. Bolster is at present working as a Lay Assistant Commissioner in the districts of Bandon, Clonakilty, and Dunmanway, Mr. Bolster reports that he has no personal interests in the districts in which he is working. He has acted as a Lay Assistant Commissioner for over eight years, and the Land Commissioners have every confidence in his impartiality.

Extra Police Charges remitted in Galway.

Mr. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland under what circumstances the sum of £756 13s. 3d. was remitted for extra police charges in the case of the county of Galway; and how this case can be distinguished from the county of Armagh.

(*Answered by Mr. Wyndham.*) I have already, namely, on the 24th and 28th March and 18th April,† explained to my hon. friend the reasons which led to the remission of this and certain other sums, and I also explained the circumstances which differentiated the charge in the case of Galway and the other counties enumerated from the case of Armagh.

Poisoning of Fish in River Lee by Outflow from Royal Gunpowder Factory.

Colonel LOCKWOOD (Essex, Epping): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he has received a communication from the Lee Conservancy Board to the effect that from 10 to 12 lbs. of fish have been found dead in the River Lee; and, if so, will he say what steps he proposes to take to prevent the poisoning of fish in that river by acid and other refuse that escapes from the cordite and gun cotton works at Waltham Abbey.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Arnold-Forster.*) A communication to that effect has been received from the Lee Conservancy Board. As the result of a previous communication from the same board as to the nature of the effluents from the Royal Gunpowder Factory the matter was, in December, 1903, referred to the Local Government Board who forwarded a report of their inspector on the subject. The works based upon the recommendations contained in that report will be completed in two or three weeks, when all cause for complaint will be removed.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxxii., 610 and 823, cxxxiii., 364.

The Crown Agents.

Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL (Yorkshire, Cleveland): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he will state how many firms were invited by the Crown Agents to tender for the supply of each of the following articles on the latest occasion within the last three years on which an order for considerable quantities of such articles was given by the Crown Agents, namely:—railway rails, steel sleepers, steel bridges, locomotives, railway trucks, railway carriages, electric cranes, steam cranes, corrugated iron, iron pipes, cement, telegraph wire, electric cables, telegraph insulators, machinery for electric lighting, engine coal, rifles, cartridges, and harness.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*) The preparation of the answer to this Question will take some time. If the hon. Member will move for the information in the form of a Return I shall be prepared to give it.

Salaries and Commission of Crown Agents.

Mr. SCOTT MONTAGU (Hampshire, New Forest): To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he will state what are the salaries paid respectively to the Crown Agents, and what is done with any surplus out of the commission after paying salaries and office expenses; and what are the scales of commission charges for services in raising loans, and for services in connection with sending out material such as rails or railway materials.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Lyttelton.*) The salaries at present paid to the three Crown Agents are £2,300, £1,450, and £1,200 respectively; any surplus arising out of the receipts from commissions, etc., is carried to a reserve fund, the income of which is applicable to meeting the charges for the pensions of themselves and their staff and the deficits which in some years occur in their office fund accounts. The hon. Member will find full particulars as to the authorised scales of commission for different services in the enclosure to the circular despatch which I have recently addressed to the Colonial Governments who employ them, and which has been laid before Parliament in Cd. 1944.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

British and Foreign Battleship Construction.

Mr. YERBURGH (Chester): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty what were the total number of battleships built and building in 1900 and in 1904, according to official returns for Great Britain and for France and Germany combined; and how many battleships there are now in commission away from European waters belonging to Great Britain and to France and Germany.

The SECRETARY to the ADMIRALTY (Mr. Pretyman, Suffolk, Woodbridge): The total number of battleships built and building for Great Britain in the years named was as follows:—1900, seventy (including twenty-three second and third-class); 1904, sixty-five (including six second and third-class). The total number for France and Germany combined was as follows:—1900, fifty-seven; 1904, seventy-four. There are now in commission away from European waters, five battleships belonging to Great Britain, and one belonging to France.

Battleship Life Limits.

Mr. YERBURGH: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether, in view of the accepted life of a battleship being twenty-five years, it is the case that in 1907 five first and second-class battleships, appearing in the Admiralty Return of fleets just issued, will have exceeded this life limit; and whether, to replace such ships in the said year, it would be necessary to lay down five ships in the year.

Mr. PRETYMAN: No rule is laid down as to the accepted life of a battleship; but in the Return of Fleets just issued there are six battleships, viz., one first-class, four second, and one third, which will have either attained or exceeded twenty-five years life (from date of launching) in 1907. The point raised in the last part of my hon. friend's Question was fully considered in settling the shipbuilding programme of the present year.

North of Scotland Fisheries—Prevention of Illegal Trawling.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland, having regard to the fact that H.M.S. "Jackal," which has hitherto been engaged in protecting the interests of the line fishermen from the depredations of illegal trawling off the coasts of the Highlands and Islands of Scotland, recently made three cruises for the purposes of scientific research in connection with the International North Sea Investigations, will he state what Admiralty vessel was detailed to perform the sea police duties of the "Jackal" during her two months absence.

MR PRETYMAN: The "Jackal" was detailed for scientific research at the request of the Scotch Fishery Board, and as part of her fishery duties. No relief ship has, therefore, been detailed.

Mortality among the Natives in the Transvaal Mines.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL (Yorkshire, Cleveland): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can state the number of natives employed in the mines of the Transvaal generally and of the Rand in particular, or the number employed either in the Transvaal or on the Rand, who died in the year 1903; and, if not, if he will say on what data the death rates per 1,000 have been calculated.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. LYTTELTON, Warwick and Leamington): The data on which are calculated the death rate per 1,000 which I quoted in the House on Wednesday last are given at page 389 of Cd. 1897 and page 58 of Cd. 2025 just issued. The two sets of figures do not relate to exactly the same areas, but the data given in the Blue-books show that the deaths for January to July, 1903, on mines in Johannesburg, Krugersdorp, Boksburg, Germiston, and Springs were 2,514, and that for August to December on the mines including these districts and also Klerksdorp, Heildelberg, and Vereeniging the deaths were 2,319.

Mine Doctors' Report on Disease among Natives on the Rand.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he will present to this House the Report of the Committee of Mine Doctors who recently reported to the Transvaal Commissioner of Native Affairs on the causes of disease among natives on the Rand.

MR. LYTTELTON: I have not been informed of any Report of the Committee of Mine Doctors later than that of 6th June, 1903, published in Cd. 1897.

Chinese Labour in the Transvaal—Commissariat Arrangements.

MR. DUNCAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Otley): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies can he state if arrangements will be made within the compounds in South Africa for the sale to the families of the Chinese labourers of provisions and the necessaries of life at prices commensurate with the wages to be paid.

MR. LYTTELTON: I would refer the hon. Member to Lord Milner's assurance on the subject printed in Cd. 1986 at page 3.

The Tibetan Mission—Advance on Lhasa.

MR. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W. R., Elland): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether the Government will wait to give final sanction to the advance on Lhasa till the Chinese Amban has arrived at Gyangtse and the Report of his dealings with our Commissioners has been published.

MR. FLYNN (Cork County, N.): At the same time may I ask the Secretary of State for India whether, in view of the despatch dated 6th November, 1903, sent to the Viceroy of India, the contemplated armed expedition to Lhasa will be delayed until this House has had an opportunity of deciding on the propriety of taking such action.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): As I stated in this House on the

12th inst., the advance on Lhasa has been actually sanctioned, unless, within a period to be fixed by the Government of India, the Chinese Amban arrives at Gyangtse accompanied by a competent Tibetan negotiator. If this condition is not fulfilled, the advance will take place without any further sanction.

MR. FLYNN: Have the Government dropped the policy enunciated by the Prime Minister and adopted Lord Curzon's forward policy?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

MR. TREVELYAN: Who are the Government of India to give sanction in Lord Curzon's absence?

MR. BRODRICK: The next senior Governor, Lord Ampthill, is administering the Government of India in Lord Curzon's absence.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): Has the period referred to been yet fixed?

MR. BRODRICK: It is for the Government of India to decide the period, and His Majesty's Government has not yet been informed of their decision.

Strength of the Tibetan Expedition.

MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India what is the effective fighting strength of the expedition now at Gyangtse, with the number of guns, rifles, and ammunition; for how long is it provisioned; whether supplies are available in the country; what is the length of the communications, the strength of the forces on them; and what is the nearest British force available should the expedition need relief.

MR. BRODRICK: The hon. Member asks a series of Questions calculated to elicit information which I think he will realise it would not be in the public interest to give. General Macdonald informed us on the 14th inst. that the Mission is safe at Gyangtse. His Majesty's Government have sanctioned the despatch of any reinforcements which the Indian Government may consider necessary for the safety of the Mission and its communications.

Date of Advance to Lhasa — Chinese Suzerainty in Tibet.

MR. LAMBERT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India what is the period fixed before which the Tibetan Expedition will proceed to Lhasa; where is the Chinese Amban to whom notice is to be given; how is it proposed to communicate with him; and what is the character of the Chinese suzerainty in Tibet.

MR. BRODRICK: As I have already stated, I have not yet been informed by the Government of India of the date they will name in the communication to be sent to the Chinese Amban for the advance of the Mission, in the event of the Tibetan Government failing to send competent negotiators to Gyangtse. The Chinese Amban is not reported to have left Lhasa. The communication will, I presume, be sent to him there in the same manner as previous letters to him. The character of the Chinese suzerainty in Tibet is shown in Prince Ching's Note of the 5th December, 1902, explaining the instructions sent by the Chinese Government to the Amban at Lhasa. It is printed at page 147 of the Tibet Blue-book.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar): Was the Chinese Government communicated with before the ultimatum was sent?

MR. BRODRICK: The information was given jointly to the Chinese Government and the Amban.

Smoke Nuisance—Foreign Legislation.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs will consent to instruct His Majesty's representatives in France, Germany, Austria-Hungary, Italy, Belgium, Holland, Switzerland, and the United States of America to furnish Reports on the laws in force in those countries respectively, and for the United States in a few typical States, for the regulation, restriction, or prevention of the emission of smoke from factories and other business premises and from private dwelling houses, with such extracts from those laws as may be needed to explain their operation.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Earl PERCY, Kensington, S.): Yes, Sir. I understand that the object of the right hon. Gentleman will be met, as regards the United States, by Reports on the laws in force in the States of Pennsylvania, New York, Illinois, and Massachusetts.

Chinese War Indemnity.

MR. McCRAE (Edinburgh, E.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he can now state whether the annual instalments of over £300,000 receivable in respect of the Chinese war indemnity will, after the private claims of British subjects have been satisfied, be applied to the reduction of debt according to the terms of the undertaking of the Chancellor of the Exchequer in 1902.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): The instalment receivable from China at the end of next month is expected to suffice for paying off the balance of the private claims. The remaining instalments will be applicable to the discharge of the British Government claim and of certain claims in respect of damage to the Northern Railways, which were included in the Government claim. It has not yet been settled in what manner the railway claims are to be liquidated. Pending settlement on that matter, it would be premature to propose to Parliament to decide as to the ultimate application of the receipts.

Eastern Mail Service Committee's Report.

MR. EVELYN CECIL (Aston Manor): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he can now lay upon the Table the Report of the Eastern Mail Service Committee, and what opportunity will be given for discussion upon it.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): I have this day laid the Report on the Table. The opportunity for discussion upon it will arise when the Estimates for the Post Office Packet Services are brought forward.

The Workmen's Compensation Act, 1897—Proposed Amendment.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS (Glamorganshire, Mid): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether the Home Office have yet concluded the inquiries referred to by the Home Secretary last session, preliminary to the introduction of a Bill to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1897; and when the Government propose to introduce a Bill for the purpose of amending and extending the said Act.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): I cannot add anything to the answers which I have recently given on this subject, except, perhaps, that I understand that the Departmental Committee is making good progress with its Report.

Gambling Prosecutions.

MR. MANSFIELD (Lincolnshire, Spalding): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he can state the number of prosecutions which have been instituted for each year within the last ten years against persons for keeping premises which have been used for purposes of gambling; will he also state how many of these prosecutions were instituted against persons of foreign origin.

*MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS: The annual volumes of Criminal Statistics show the total number of prosecutions for "betting and gaming," but the nature of the various offences included under this head is not distinguished nor are the nationalities of the defendants given, and I am afraid I cannot give the hon. Member the precise details which he desires.

Scientific Results of Vivisection.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, whether he can state what scientific results have been derived from the vivisection of dogs and other animals during the past year.

*MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS: I think the hon. Member is asking rather too much if he expects me to compress into the form of an answer to a Question the scientific results of a year's experimental research. I would refer him to the periodical transactions of learned societies, to various essays, and to other scattered publications, both past and future, for no doubt some of last year's results have not yet been published. I cannot give the hon. Member the information he desires.

Vehicular Traffic Regulations in the Metropolis.

Mr. CAUSTON (Southwark, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, if the view expressed in his letter of 3rd July, 1903, to certain owners of vehicles, that, if the driver of a vehicle could see in front and on each side of him, within the range of an arc of 180 degrees, that would be considered as reasonably complying with the requirements of the London County Council's by-law on the subject, has been communicated to the Chief Commissioner of Police; and, if not, will he cause such an instruction to be issued for the guidance of the police authorities.

Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS: I presume the hon. Member has in mind the proceedings taken against Messrs. Carter, Paterson & Co. in the Guildhall Court last week. I have no special information as to the facts of that case, or the grounds of the decision of the Court, but I may say that it was not intended by the London County Council in proposing the by-law to require a wider view of traffic than that contained within an arc of 180 degrees. The case in question was a City one, and I am in communication with the Commissioner of City Police on the subject.

Teachers on Education Authorities.

Mr. MANSFIELD: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Education, if he is aware that teachers in public elementary schools have been elected members of a county, borough, or urban district council having the administration of the Education Act of 1902 within its area; and, if so, does he propose to take any action in the matter.

The PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY to the BOARD of EDUCATION (Sir William Anson, Oxford University): I am not aware of any such cases.

London County Council Education Committee and the Press.

Mr. ATHERLEY-JONES (Durham, N. W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Education, whether his attention has been called to the fact that the Education Committee of the London County Council has resolved that at the sittings of that committee the public and the press shall be excluded; whether it be the practice of educational committees in the provinces to so hold their sittings in private; whether the Education Board have sanctioned that decision of the Education Committee of the London County Council; and, if not, whether he will make representations to the committee of the views of the Board of Education.

Sir WILLIAM ANSON: I am aware that the London County Council have resolved that the public and the Press shall be excluded from the meetings of their Education Committee. The publicity of the meetings of education committees is a matter of procedure which every local authority regulates for itself. The Board of Education have reason to believe that the education committees in the provinces usually held their sittings in public, but the procedure of local authorities in the conduct of their business is not a subject for sanction or representation by the Board.

St James's Park Paths.

Captain NORTON (Newington, W.): I beg to ask the hon. Member for Chorley, as representing the First Commissioner of Works, whether his attention has been drawn to the state of the asphalted paths in St. James's Park, more especially to that on the bridge which spans the ornamental water; and whether he will take steps to have them repaired.

Lord BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): The answer to the first paragraph is in the affirmative: the paths in question will be repaired in the autumn, that being the season when the work can be carried out with the least inconvenience to the public.

Cahirciveen Estuary—Buoys.

Mr. BOLAND (Kerry S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is now in a position to state what is the authority competent to undertake the placing of buoys and perches in the estuary of the Cahirciveen river, county Kerry; and whether immediate steps will be taken to carry out the work.

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Mr. Wyndham, Dover): The Congested Districts Board has been advised that it is a lighthouse authority under the provisions of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894. The Board has informed the county council that it will undertake the erection of buoys or perches at the entrance to the river, provided the county authorities are prepared to contribute the sum of £50 towards the cost, and provided the Commissioners of Irish Lights approve of the erection of the buoys. The Board awaits a reply from the county council before taking further action.

Mr. JOYCE (Limerick): Why is it that the Irish Lights Commissioners themselves did not put down the buoys and beacons?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! That is a matter of argument.

Mr. JOYCE: No.

Mr. FLYNN: Why has it taken the Board four years to find out that it is the authority?

Mr. JOYCE: Why do not the Irish Lights Commissioners do the work?

[No answer was returned.]

Granard Workhouse Master.

Mr. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will lay upon the Table a copy of the report which led to the dismissal of the workhouse master at Granard, whom the Local Government Board had appointed; if not, will he give the name of the person who made the reports, and state the reasons for the workhouse master's dismissal.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The late master was required to resign on the ground of incapacity to properly maintain discipline in the workhouse. The Board's decision was based on information supplied by the inspector. The report made by the inspector is a confidential document and, as such, cannot be laid on the Table of the House.

Dundrum Estate, County Tipperary.

Mr. KENDAL O'BRIEN (Tipperary, Mid.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, with a view to hastening and facilitating the sale of the Dundrum Estate of the Earl de Montalt, in county Tipperary, he will take steps to have the Chief Land Commission sit immediately in the town of Tipperary, or other convenient centre, to hear appeals from the Sub-Commission Court for the purpose of fixing fair rents, the applications for which in the estate referred to, as well as in others, have been in Court for nearly seven years.

Mr. WYNDHAM: Thirty-two fair rent appeals are pending from this estate. Twenty-seven of these appeared on the preliminary list already issued for hearing at Waterford, but the Tipperary cases were removed from the final list owing to complaints received from several parties as to the place of hearing. It has not been yet found possible to arrange for a sitting to dispose of the Tipperary cases. None of the appeals from this district are pending for seven years; the longest outstanding notices of appeal were lodged in July, 1900.

Ballinasloe Asylum—Dr. Kirwan's Appointment.

Mr. ROCHE (Galway, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state what is the cause of the delay in sanctioning the appointment of Doctor Kirwan as resident medical superintendent to the Ballinasloe Asylum; whether Doctor Kirwan is duly qualified for the position; and whether the committee have expressed their dissatisfaction at the withholding of the sanction such a length of time.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The official file of papers containing the correspondence that has passed on the subject of this appointment is before me to-day. I must ask the hon. Member, as well as my hon. friend the Member for South Belfast, to postpone their Questions till Wednesday.

The following is the Question of the hon. Member for South Belfast referred to—

Mr. SLOAN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the fact that at a meeting of the Committee of Management of the Ballinasloe District Asylum, held on the 9th instant, a letter was read from the Lord-Lieutenant asking to be informed why, in electing Dr. Kirwan to the vacant office of resident medical superintendent, they had passed over the senior assistant medical officer of the asylum; and, if so, can he state whether information was refused to the Lord-Lieutenant; and, if so, what action, if any, does he intend to take in the matter.

Lough Neagh Drainage.

Mr. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if the engineer appointed to report on the drainage of Lough Neagh has made his report; and, if so, on what occasion, and in what manner, does he propose to make it public.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The engineer's report on the drainage of Lough Neagh will be ready in about four weeks. It will be communicated to the Treasury and to the Irish Government. The question whether further publicity should be given to the report, and, if so, the form the publication should take, will be considered when the report has been made.

College of Science, Dublin—Appointment of Architect.

Mr. MOONEY (Dublin County, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, as President of the Board of Works, Ireland, and the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction, whether the Treasury, before making the appointment of architect for the proposed new buildings of the College of Science, Dublin, consulted with those Departments; and, if so, did they, or either of them, suggest that an Irish architect should be employed.

Mr. WYNDHAM: I do not occupy the position of President of the Board of Works, a Department which is under the Treasury. I was, however, consulted on more than one occasion. Inter-departmental communications of this kind are confidential.

Bicycle Thefts in Dublin.

Mr. MOONEY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland how many cases of theft of bicycles in Dublin have been reported to the police within the past twelve months; how many of such cases have occurred within the past month; in how many of all these cases have arrests been made and convictions obtained respectively; and what other steps have been taken to bring offenders to justice.

Mr. WYNDHAM: 209 thefts of bicycles were reported to the police during the past twelve months; of these seventy-eight were recovered. There were twenty-two thefts last month; in four cases the bicycles were recovered. Twenty-one persons were arrested; sixteen were convicted and five discharged. The police use every endeavour suggested by experience in such matters to bring offenders to justice.

Labourers' Cottages (Ireland) Return.

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY (Limerick, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state what is the cause of delay in the publication of the Return dealing with Labourers' Cottages (Ireland), laid upon the Table of the House on the 28th ultimo.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The Irish Government is not answerable for the printing of Parliamentary Papers. I am informed, however, that there has been no avoidable delay in this case, and that the Return will be circulated in a day or two.

Re-instatement of Evicted Tenants.

MR. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what steps the Estates Commissioners have taken to secure the re-instatement of evicted tenants like Mr. Daniel Shea on the Kenmare Estate, and Mr. Morty Buckley on the Morrogh Bernard Estate, and other similar cases where the farms are at present untenanted in the county of Kerry; whether the Commissioners will at once negotiate for a re-instatement of such tenants even if a general sale of the landlord's estate does not take place; and, in the event of such landlords obstructing re-instatement, do the Estates Commissioners possess or will he take steps to give them legislative powers to enforce their decision.

MR. WYNDHAM: No application for the sale of the estates on which the two evicted holdings in question are situated has yet been made to the Estates Commissioners. Failing such application the Commissioners are empowered to arrange, where possible, for the accommodation of evicted tenants on other untenanted lands in the neighbourhood that may be acquired by them. The sale to an evicted tenant of his previous holding can best be effected as a part of a general arrangement for the sale of an estate.

MR. MURPHY: I want to ask if, in the case of the farms of evicted tenants still untenanted, the Estates Commissioners will do anything to secure the re-instatement of the tenants? This matter is of great importance in the county of Kerry. Will the right hon. Gentleman call upon the Estates Commissioners to take action in the matter?

MR. WYNDHAM replied that the Estates Commissioners were fully alive to the importance of the matter and he had every confidence in them; no useful purpose was served by continually raising the question.

Tredinnick Estate, County Roscommon.

MR. HAYDEN (Roscommon, S.): On behalf of the hon. Member for North Roscommon, I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the owner of the estate of W. R. Tredinnick (county Roscommon) now in the Land Judge's Court, is negotiating a sale to the Congested Districts Board; whether the Congested Districts Board have entered into or completed any negotiations for purchase; whether, seeing that the estate is now in Court for twenty-three years, he will say if any steps have been taken by the Land Judge to carry out a sale of the property, or if he proposes to take any steps to expedite a sale.

MR. WYNDHAM: Negotiations took place in 1900 between the Congested Districts Board and Captain Tredinnick, but were broken off by the latter. There are no proceedings pending in the Land Judge's Court in respect of the sale of the property.

Belcoo Police Force.

MR. JORDAN (Fermanagh, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will make further inquiries to ascertain if the increased Constabulary force now at Belcoo, or a further augmented force there, would be sufficient for the discharge of all the duties not only at Belcoo but at Letter Breen and Carngreen stations, and thereby diminish the Constabulary expenses in those districts.

MR. WYNDHAM: The hon. Member's Question is based on a misapprehension. There are no extra police stationed in the county and consequently the employment of police at these stations entails no expense to the localities. It is not proposed to make any further change at present in the existing arrangements.

Religious Nomenclature- "Catholic" or Roman Catholic.

The following Question appeared on the Paper:—

MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a memorial forwarded to the Department of Agriculture by the Roman Catholic clerks in the Veterinary Branch of the Department, asking for an increment of salary, was suppressed by the chief clerk, who declined to forward the petition to the heads of the Department, and threatened that any attempt at a renewal of the application would be visited by dismissal; and, if so, whether he will state if the Department is willing to consider the alleged grievances of those officials.

On being called on to put the Question the hon. Member protested that the clerks at the Table had again inserted the word "Roman" before "Catholic." He asked the Speaker if it had been done by his authority.

MR. SPEAKER: I think it is well known to most hon. Members that the word "Roman" as such is not intended, and never is supposed to be, an offensive observation or description. The word is one that is used not for the purpose of creating, but of avoiding, any feelings of religious objection or animosity of any kind. It is not objected to in that sense, and as the use of the word "Catholic" is one which is claimed by other Churches as well, the insertion of "Roman" is merely intended to avoid any dispute or difference or ambiguity, and for no other purpose is it used. It is always the practice to indicate by the word "Roman" what Church is meant.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): May I ask, in view of the fact that the word "Roman" is regarded as offensive —[MINISTERIAL cries of "No, no!"] [A NATIONALIST MEMBER: How do you know?] Inasmuch as it is regarded as offensive by the Roman Catholic Members of this House—[ironical cheers]—by Catholic Members of this House, and inasmuch as it is never used by us, whether in these circumstances you will consider the inserting of the word in these Questions, against our wishes, is inadvisable?

MR. SPEAKER: I am afraid if I adopted that suggestion it would only give rise to fresh disputes. I may point out to hon. Members that one of the hon. Members from Ireland, whose religion I do not know, had a Bill last year called the Roman Catholic Disabilities Removal Bill, which he introduced under that title, and in which he speaks of Catholics throughout the whole Bill as "Roman Catholics."

MR. JOHN REDMOND: It is an historic fact, and no one can dispute it, that the appellation is always regarded as offensive by the Catholics of Ireland.

MR. SPEAKER: I should be personally extremely anxious to avoid giving offence to any denomination. I will consider the point.

MR. DELANY: I beg to give notice that I will put this Question down for to-morrow (Tuesday), in its original form, in order to secure your ruling.

Case of Michael Curtin.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state what statement was made by the Coroner's jury in the city of Cork regarding the action of the resident magistrate, W. Flanagan, in refusing bail to Michael Curtin, of Mountcollins, in the county of Limerick, who was sent for trial to the Cork Assize charged with taking forcible possession of a dwelling-house from which he and his family were evicted, and who died in Cork Prison.

MR. WYNDHAM: The jury made no comment on the action of the resident magistrate. The Coroner made some observations.

Banbridge Disturbances.

MR. SLOAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if his attention has been called to the fact that a number of Roman Catholics who were attending a Roman Catholic concert in Banbridge on the 6th instant entered a number of private gardens, pulled up the flowers, threw them on the public road, and otherwise destroyed private property; and, if so, will he say whether any arrests have been made, and what action, if any, does he intend taking in the matter.

MR. WYNDHAM: It is true that some flowers were plucked from the gardens of three houses on the date mentioned. No other injury to private property was committed. There is no evidence, whatever, to show that the damage was caused by Roman Catholics. No arrests have been made.

MR. SLOAN: Did not the police receive complaints of the damage?

MR. WYNDHAM: There was nothing to show by whom it were done.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that one of the plucked flowers is being worn in the House at this moment?

[No answer was returned.]

Price asked for Land by Trinity College, Dublin.

MR. FLAVIN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a meeting was held at Ballylongford, North Kerry, on the 24th April, 1904, presided over by the Rev. P. Pierce; that at that meeting the question of the offer of Trinity College, Dublin, to sell their property at twenty-seven years purchase was considered and rejected, owing to the price demanded by Trinity College; and, if so, what action he intends to take in the matter; and whether, seeing that the greater portion of this property is cutaway bog and mountain land, he can state the average price paid in the year's purchase by tenants in Kerry since 1886, and also what is the highest average price paid any one year from 1886 to 1892.

MR. WYNDHAM I have no information on the first portion of the Question. If I may assume that it refers to the redemption of head-rents, no analogy can be drawn between such a redemption and the purchase of their holdings by occupying tenants. A different procedure applies to a transaction of a wholly different character. I stated on Thursday last that if the middleman does not agree to the price demanded for the redemption of the head-rent the provisions of the 64th Section of the Act of 1903 can be availed of to have the price determined by either the Land Judge or Judicial Commissioner, as the case may be. Such a case was recently referred to Mr. Justice Meredith, and after hearing fully the evidence, he fixed the redemption price for the College at twenty-six and one-tenth years purchase.

MR. FLAVIN: But the right hon. Gentleman has missed the point. Trinity College is the direct landlord not the head landlord. Will the right hon. Gentleman inquire whether the College is not asking twenty-nine years purchase while for the past sixteen years the average price has been sixteen years purchase?

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): Does the right hon. Gentleman propose to do anything with regard to the practice now obtaining in various parts of Ireland of demanding extravagant prices?

MR. WYNDHAM: I really cannot enter on a debate as to whether the prices are extravagant. The Act of last year makes provision for dealing with matters of that kind. I can add nothing to my answer.

MR. FLAVIN: Will the right hon. Gentleman answer my Question?

MR. SPEAKER: The right hon. Gentleman says he has given the only answer he can.

MR. FLAVIN: But his answer was as to head landlords—not direct landlords. I will draw attention to this on the first opportunity.

Borrisoleigh Band and the Police.

MR. P. J. O'BRIEN (Tipperary, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the local band at Borrisoleigh, North Tipperary, when performing along the public road are followed by policemen, who keep close to and hustle the bandsmen; and, if so, by whose orders is this course adopted; and, seeing that this little village is burthened with the cost of extra police, notwithstanding that the district is perfectly peaceable and free from crime, will he take steps to secure this village band from being so interfered with, and that the district may be relieved from the unnecessary burthen of four extra police on a population of only 600; and if he will state how many persons there were convicted of agrarian offences during the past eighteen months.

MR. WYNDHAM: The band referred to in the Question usually parades at night and its members and crowd of followers indulge in groaning when passing the houses of persons whose names it is unnecessary to mention. Two constables accompany the band on such occasions, but they carry out this duty unobtrusively and do not hustle the bandsmen, as alleged. The police force at Borrisoleigh has been augmented by three men, drawn from other stations in the county. Their employment involves no charge to local rates. There were convictions in respect of two agrarian offences during the past eighteen months.

Mr. P. J. O'BRIEN: The band parades in daylight—not at night time.

Sanitary Accommodation in North of Ireland Trains.

Mr. JORDAN (Fermanagh, S.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to complaints in the Press and otherwise, by the travelling public that the Great Northern Railway Company of Ireland run certain trains daily from Derry to Belfast, viâ Enniskillen and Clones, a distance of 140 miles, and from Derry to Dundalk, viâ Enniskillen and Clones, a distance of 120 miles, on which there is neither lavatory or sanitary accommodation in either first, second, or third-class carriages; and, if so, will he make representations to the railway company to secure a remedy for this state of affairs.

The PRESIDENT of the BOARD of TRADE (Mr. Gerald Balfour, Leeds, Central): No complaints have been received by the Board of Trade in this matter, which is not one in which the Department has any statutory powers of intervention. I have, however, communicated the hon. Member's Question to the railway company and have received a reply of which I am sending him a copy.

Irish Telegraph Service—Case of Mark Finnerty.

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he can state why a boy named Mark Finnerty, of Croom, in the county of Limerick, who got ninth place in the examination last August for male learners in the General Post Office, and who obtained medical certificate, has not yet been called upon to fill one of the vacancies then existing.

Lord STANLEY: I am glad to inform the hon. Member that an opportunity has occurred for admitting Finnerty as a learner in Dublin.

Irish Telegraphs—Clones Limited Competition.

Mr. SLOAN: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he is aware that there were four applications to sit for a limited competition held at Clones in the autumn of 1903, at which one candidate failed, and that the rejected candidate has since been given an appointment in place of the successful person; and, if so, will he explain the reason for this departure from the usual practice of the Department.

Lord STANLEY: There was no competition at Clones in 1903. For the February competition of 1904 three candidates were nominated and the successful candidate obtained his Civil Service certificate on the 9th instant, and will be called up for duty as a learner at once. A candidate who was at first refused permission to compete has, upon receipt of further favourable evidence as to his character, been admitted as a learner at Clones, but this will not necessarily entitle him to an established appointment there, and in any case will not prejudice in any way the position of the learner who was successful in the competition.

Bank of Ireland—Advance to the Government during South African War.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if the Bank of Ireland advanced £1,000,000 to the Government during the South African War; and, if so, how was this advance made; whether it was advanced free of interest, and, if not, what rate of interest was paid by the Government for this advance, and for how long; and if this £1,000,000 was derived from the Exchequer balances or other funds standing to the credit of the Government at the Bank of Ireland.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: As provided for by Section 2 of the Appropriation Act, 1900, the Bank of Ireland advanced a sum of £750,000 to the Treasury on the 20th September, 1900. That advance was repaid on the 20th December in the same year, on which day the bank made a further advance of £1,000,000, which was repaid by instalments between 11th February and 4th March, 1901. Both advances bore interest at the rate of 3½ per cent. per annum, regard being had in fixing this rate to the current rate at which the Government could temporarily borrow. I have no means of saying from what source the bank drew money for these advances.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: Am I to understand that the Bank of Ireland, having public funds at its disposal to the amount of £1,250,000, for which it pays no interest at all, lent £1,000,000 of that to the British taxpayer and charged 3½ per cent? Will the right hon. Gentleman consider the advisability of appointing a Commission or a Committee to inquire into the relations of the Bank of Ireland and the Government?

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I informed the hon. and learned Member a few days ago that I thought the time for reconsidering the relations of the Government and the Bank of Ireland would come when the period for which those relations were fixed expired. I believe that will be in 1912. The relations between the two have been fixed by statute, the arrangement being made in view of all the circumstances of the case.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: But will you consider the desirability of appointing a Committee?

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The hon. Member is asking me to appoint a Committee to re-open a matter settled after full consideration, a matter to which there are two parties——

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: And a third, the taxpayer.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I cannot undertake to re-open the matter.

Certification of Deaths in the Highlands.

Mr. WEIR: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, in view of the fact that in some districts of Ross-shire half the deaths are uncertified and that similar conditions prevail in other Highland crofting counties, will he state whether he purposes to propose legislation to deal with the matter.

The PRIME MINISTER and FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Manchester, E.): It is not proposed at the present time to introduce any such legislation.

Mr. WEIR: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that this state of affairs in the Highlands has been going on for many years?

[No answer was returned.]

Tuberculosis Inquiry.

Mr. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he will assent to the Motion, standing on this day's Paper, for a Select Committee to inquire into the question of compensation in respect of tuberculosis as it affects farmers as well as butchers, and not proceed further with the Motion for a Select Committee on the Tuberculosis (Animals) Compensation Bill.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The right hon. Gentleman is aware that two private Bills dealing with this subject have been referred to a Select Committee, and as long as that Order for the Select Committee remains on the Paper, I do not think it possible to accede to his request. I think he should negotiate with the gentlemen responsible for those Bills and possibly some agreement may be arrived at.

Mr. CHANNING: I will act on the right hon. Gentleman's suggestion.

MONUMENT TO THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY.

Committee to consider an Address to His Majesty, praying that His Majesty will give directions that a Monument be erected at the Public Charge in the Collegiate Church of St. Peter, Westminster, to the memory of the late right hon. the Marquess of Salisbury; to-morrow. (*Mr. Secretary Brodrick.*)

MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): Is the Motion to be taken to-morrow?

MR. SPEAKER: The Committee is put down for to-morrow.

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Mr. HALSEY reported from the Committee of Selection, That they had discharged the following Member from the Standing Committee on Law, and Courts of Justice, and Legal Procedure: Mr. Attorney-General; and had appointed in substitution: Mr. Solicitor-General.

Report to lie upon the Table.

BISHOPRICS OF SOUTHWARK AND BIRMINGHAM BILL.

Reported without Amendment, from the Standing Committee on Law, etc.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 179.]

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 179.]

Bill to be taken into consideration to-morrow.

STANDING COMMITTEES (CHAIRMEN'S PANEL).

Sir JAMES FERGUSSON reported from the Chairmen's Panel, That they had appointed Sir James Fergusson to act as Chairman of the Standing Committee for the consideration of Bills relating to Law, and Courts of Justice, and Legal Procedure, in the place of Mr. Laurence Hardy.

Sir JAMES FERGUSSON further reported, That they had appointed Mr. John Edward Ellis to act as Chairman of the Standing Committee for the consideration of Bills relating to Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufactures, in the place of Mr. Stuart-Wortley.

Reports to lie upon the Table.

NEW BILL.

SOLICITORS BILL.

"To apply Section 16 of The Solicitors Act, 1888, to Solicitors who are undischarged bankrupts," presented by Mr. Attorney-General; supported by Mr. Solicitor-General; to be read a second time upon Tuesday, 31st May, and to be printed. [Bill 197.]

FINANCE BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): We have now arrived at a period in the work of the session, and I think it is the earliest period, when it is possible for us to take a general review of the financial policy of the Government as a whole. True, the Bill which is before us concerns itself with ways and means, with the raising of revenue, with the imposition or modification or relaxation of duties; but this House would be taking a somewhat narrow view of its functions and responsibilities if it allowed itself to be lost in the technicalities of taxation, and if, while dealing with all those matters which legitimately come before it on this Bill, it were to weigh one tax against another one, and one burden against another, and not direct a large share of its attention to the large question of the circumstances which necessitate the taxation which we are invited to impose. While I think this to be true in all years, I think it is especially true at the present moment, when the question which attracts attention in the country and excites alarm is not the question of one tax or another tax, but that of the unprecedently vast and growing expenditure which is incurred on behalf of the people of the country. There ought to be, there must be, surely one period in our financial business when this House can pronounce judgment upon the general financial situation in all its parts and aspects, and that period appears to me to be the Second Reading of the Finance Bill. I will not spend time in making excuses therefore, but will proceed to submit my Amendment, which invites a protest against the large and continuous increase of national expenditure in recent years.

But first may I be allowed briefly to anticipate two stock replies that are always made when this complaint is put before the House? We shall be told, no doubt, as we have been told on previous occasions, that we have already assented to the Estimates of the year, or are in course of giving assent to them, and that it is too late, therefore, to raise objection. Well, putting aside the fact that objections are often taken to Votes, and especially to the governing Votes of the great spending services, such as the number of men in the Army, and that if those objections are carried to a division and the contention is defeated, at all events those who raised the objection are absolved from being liable to this reply, the Estimates come before us piecemeal and in individual Votes, and how are we to tell which ought to be rejected and which ought to be approved? We have not the knowledge or the materials for the knowledge; and I confess at once that I am not one of those who take a very sanguine view of the good effects that would follow if the House were to enlarge its responsibility in this respect in some of the ways which are sometimes suggested. But I have on this subject a little bit of sound doctrine, an ounce of doctrine which I hope may be allowed to have that degree of weight, and which I should like to quote to the House, by Mr. Gladstone. I shall have occasion, I think, again in the course of my observations to quote Mr. Gladstone, and I think everybody, even those who differed most warmly from him in general politics, will admit that he was in our time the highest authority on this question of financial procedure. This is what he said in 1868—

> "To my astonishment the doctrine seems to have been laid down by the Chancellor of the Exchequer that when once the Estimates have been accepted by independent Members the House is responsible for them in the same degree as the Minister of the Crown. It is impossible too emphatically to pronounce against that opinion. It is entirely contrary to the relation in which he stands to the House. The doctrine is monstrous. The Government have unlimited opportunities of investigating the Estimates of expenditure through the departments under the supposed control of the Treasury, and how is it possible that those who have no such power, even if they agreed to the Estimates, can be responsible in the same degree as the Government?"

That, I think, is high authority, sound constitutional doctrine, and also, by good luck, common sense at the same time. The second answer which we shall probably receive—we always do, and I believe that every Chancellor of the Exchequer will give it on every similar occasion—is that we are called upon not to confine ourselves to vague and indeterminate declarations, but to indicate the precise head of charge which we would wish to see dropped and to put our finger upon the cause and source of mischief. To that I make the same reply. We have not access to the facts and the causes. We do not know the relations and the comparative importance of the claims of particular developments of expenditure. What we see is the swelling torrent of expenditure swamping the country, exhausting and exceeding the ordinary resources of the country, necessitating the imposition of fresh taxes at a time when we had every reason to expect that taxes would be removed, bearing cruelly upon the taxpayer, crippling him and crippling the nation. We see, also, that certain policies and lavish expenditure appear to go together. Now it may be, and it generally is, that policy, according to the accepted *dictum*, governs expenditure; but there may be an occasion when expenditure is indulged in and then a policy is adopted or adapted in order to justify that expenditure. But, however this may be, we have seen them associated in like circumstances before, and we believe in their connection now; and that is ample ground for our complaint. It is idle to ask us, who have neither power nor responsibility in the matter, to say where and when, in what particular and at what time a more prudent course should have been taken.

Now, how do we stand in regard to this great growth of expenditure? The figures have often been put before the House. Putting aside the cost of the war, £230,000,000, there has been since

1895 an addition of £49,000,000 per annum to the ordinary expenditure. That is an addition of £1 3s. 4d. per head of the population to what was previously paid. The population has increased by 10 per cent., the expenditure by 50 per cent. Of this increase of £49,000,000 £40,000,000, have gone to the fighting services. Those are the main facts, but let me take the two services individually. Take first the Army. It cost in 1895 £17,900,000. The current year's Estimates are for £28,900,000. That is an increase of £11,000,000. To this we must add £3,600,000 of capital expenditure under the Military Works Act. As the hon. Member for Exeter said the other day, each Department has a little private debt of its own. I assume that that expenditure will be the same as last year. Then we must add anything from £1,000,000 to £2,000,000 for Supplementary Estimates, for the second Budget has come to be a second nature. Put the sum at £1,500,000 and we have a total of £34,000,000, close upon double the charge of 1895. I turn to the Navy. In 1895 the cost was £17,500,000. This year's Estimates and the capital charges for naval works amount to £42,300,000, and with the probable Supplementary Estimates we shall be fortunate if they are not swollen to £44,000,000. Therefore the two services together account for £78,000,000. But let us make the Government a present of the Supplementary Estimates. Let us give them credit for turning over a new leaf under the new administration. Then—and I think this is treating the right hon. Gentleman extremely handsomely—the cost will be £74,800,000 as compared with £34,400,000 in 1895. It is into this bottomless gulf of unprofitable expenditure that the money has been flung. This outbreak of expenditure has had its fiercest developments in coincidence with the South African War. Between 1895 and 1899 there was an increase of £9,000,000 on the fighting services. But in the three following years the expenditure on the Army alone increased by £9,000,000, and on the Navy by £7,000,000—together £16,000,000. That brings us up to the financial year ending March, 1902. In the next year the Estimates were practically stationary, but last year—the first complete year of peace—there was another and a most significant upward movement. The Navy charges were augmented on the Estimates by over £3,000,000. If we take into account the Supplementary Estimates and works, there would be a total of £40,000,000. This process of expansion has been carried further again in this present year. The Estimate increases have not been so serious, but the fact remains that they have not diminished, but rather augmented. If retrenchment had been used at the close of the war how different the situation would have been. It is, of course, inevitable that spending Departments should get out of hand in war. War always means wasteful expenditure in the field and at home—necessarily so. The purse strings, if not actually cast away, are at all events greatly slackened. This, I am afraid, is not in the spending Departments alone; the spirit is contagious. Again I fall back on my authority, Mr. Gladstone. In 1863—in his great financial days—Mr. Gladstone said that together with the so-called increase of expenditure there went up what might be termed a spirit of expenditure, a tendency which, insensibly and unconsciously, perhaps, but really, affected the spirit of the people, the spirit of Parliament, the spirit of the public Departments, and perhaps even the spirit of those whose duty it was to submit the Estimates to Parliament. This demoralisation is a thing we have often seen before, but never more conspicuously than within the last half-dozen years. And the gravity of the situation seems to me to lie in this, that, so far as the Army Estimates are concerned, a state of things necessarily abnormal is apparently adopted as the starting point for fresh and, as far as we can see, unlimited demands on the taxpayer. We are to march on without a halt and never to turn our eyes back to the standard of national expenditure which existed before the war.

Now, can it be pleaded that the millions thus added to Army expenditure have been laid out in accordance with any fixed plan or scheme or purpose? No. The Prime Minister within the last few months has announced the discovery of the true functions of the Army. The Secretary of State for War told us in introducing the Estimates that the discovery was not yet complete. All we know for certain is that the new conception, whatever it may be, destroys the other and earlier discovery, which was announced with no less elation two years ago. Then let the House observe that the naval expenditure also must have been conducted to a great extent in the dark, seeing that it had no reference to any co-ordinated theory of defence. Let us hope that the newly-organised department of direction at the War Office, under the Cabinet or over the Cabinet—I do not know what the relation is—will not be obliged to take the expenditure incurred and the additions made to our forces during the war as a *chose jugée.* The expenditure was incurred under the pressure of undoubted patriotism—still, without much discernment. But the House is expected to hold this standard sacred, apparently, so far as the Estimates submitted to us this year are concerned. This is the central part of the situation, and the one that differentiates it from the other cases, when at the close of the war, the question of expenditure has come up for consideration. I am afraid that reference to anything before the nineties will be set down as being early Victorian or even prehistoric; but the Prime Minister's military researches must have led him to consider what happened on two occasions in the last century—at the end of the great Continental war at the beginning of the century and at the end of the Crimean War in the middle of the century. In 1816 the Army Estimates were cut down at once, and when a famous military predecessor of the right hon. Gentleman—the Duke of Wellington—became Prime Minister, in 1828, the knife was ruthlessly and unsparingly applied. What happened after the Crimean War? Mr. Disraeli and Mr. Gladstone vied with each other in giving the Government of the day no peace and insisting on bringing expenditure back to the standard existing before the war. These precedents may be considered too remote, but they are not uninteresting or uninstructive to the country. So far as we are informed in this House, no hope of diminished expenditure has yet been exhibited. The Secretary of State for War said, taking the aggregate Vote and comparing it with last year's, we had £280,000 less than what he thought was the normal War Office Estimate. That is, the normal state of things must be taken as having been reflected by the expenditure of last year—an expenditure which was, practically, twice what it was ten years ago, and £10,000,000 in excess of the immediate pre-war standard. Then, in 1901, we were promised a reform of the Army. The Army, accordingly, was reformed amid much jubilation and self-congratulation. The reform is now gone, and all that remains is the share of taxes that was imposed. Then comes this more recent discovery. What said the Prime Minister last year, speaking on the Address, when this discovery must have been at least in part revealed? He said—

> "I greatly doubt whether any study that we can give to the strategic problems of the Empire is likely to show that in the future any great diminution in our armaments or in the cost of our armaments is likely or possible. We should be utterly contemptible if, in obedience to a natural, though I think an unfortunate, change in public opinion, we were to admit for a moment that we did not believe that the forces we have asked for are forces necessary for the safety of the Empire; if we were to diminish them by a jot, if, after having gone to the country and made Imperial speeches for four years, we were to go back to them and say, 'Imperialism was all very well when it was popular, it was all very well before the public realised what it cost, and now that it is a little less popular we will change our scale of demand for Imperial defence, and we will trim our sails to suit the changing gales of popular faith.'"

Brave words; but take the bravery out of them, and they amount to a confession of helplessness in the presence of the Frankenstein of expenditure that Ministers seem to be held by as in a vice. I do not mean any *double entendre* in using the word vice. When stripped of rhetoric this amounts to a preposterous claim to manipulate and exploit in perpetuity the war fever which is now dead and gone. But then we have the Central Asian terror. The Prime Minister is very much impressed with that. We have been face to face with that Central Asian terror for a great many years, and it has been largely used on many occasions. I think it is reasonable, at all events, to say that events are occurring in Asia which, whatever the issue of them may be, must considerably relieve the minds of those who are anxious in the matter. Let the Government follow in Asia their own good example in Europe

—on which we offer them unreserved congratulation; let them come to a good understanding and settle our differences with our neighbours. That will give more strength to our Indian Empire than doubling or trebling the South African garrison or pursuing in Tibet or elsewhere the singular policy of occupying the far side of a practically invulnerable frontier.

I will only say a word or two as to naval expenditure. Every man among us is in favour of a strong Navy. He would be blind, indeed, who did not see that it was the first condition of the policy of this country. But when we hear in after-dinner speeches, and read in leading articles, statements triumphantly made that this country will grudge no money for expenditure on the Navy, that goes considerably beyond the truth. The country must have proved to it that the expenditure is necessary; and such language, and the sentiment that it indicates, is mischievous in its effect, because it encourages expenditure which may be excessive, and, if excessive, wasteful, and, if wasteful, then hurtful to efficiency. But, again, here let the Government courageously follow their own good example to which I have already referred, and again, by friendly negotiations, secure for the States of Europe that immunity from the intolerable burdens of naval armament which can be secured by no height to which jealousies and rivalries and insane competition can carry us. When the Navy Estimates were before the House, I quoted some words of M. Delcassé, which I think are very significant and apposite. I take leave to quote them again. A Motion had been made urging France to take the initiative in suggesting a reduction of armaments to the other Powers. M. Delcassé said—

> "France has no need to speak to the nations. She has acted for several years so that her naval and military estimates have been slightly lowered. Other nations," he added, "can follow her example. Acts are worth more than idle words."

There could not be a more paradoxical situation than that in which we have the Foreign Secretary, with the earnest and noble help of His Majesty himself, turning scowling faces into the smiling faces of friends, and substituting for isolation a good mutual understanding with half-a-dozen States of Europe, and the Prime Minister, on the other hand, presiding over his military department and, as he tells us, seeing nothing but aggression and sinister designs against us on every hand.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I never suggested such a thing.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The right hon. Gentleman suggested that the navies of other countries were maintained for the purpose of aggression against us, whereas our Navy was built with no idea of engaging in aggression against anybody. Let the two great Western Powers join in choosing the better part, and secure for Europe at once relief and a new era of peace.

I have dwelt on military and naval expenditure—Why? Because in them is to be found the greatest mass of the increase—they account for four-fifths of it—because they take from us unproductive expenditure, mortgaging this immense revenue for armaments, which is unfair to the prospect of other sources of expenditure of greater direct interest to the people of the country. I speak of them especially because they ought to be most capable of reduction, and also because they are the branches of expenditure which are most dependent on policy. Again I am forced to fall back on Mr. Gladstone, and this is the last time I shall shelter myself under his authority to-day. This is what he said in 1873—

> "In the consideration of the charge for the Army and the Navy there is always mixed the question of policy together with the question of expenditure. Not only the credit of the Government, but also the whole character of the policy of the country is attached to the Estimates of the year for the Army and Navy in a sense and to a degree to which they are not attached to the Estimates for the collection of revenue and the Civil Services."

But the fact remains that in all branches of expenditure proper financial control is the touchstone of good administration. If a due hold upon the purse-strings is lacking, policy as well as expenditure goes adrift. Prudent finance strengthens the position of the country. Easy finance goes with clap-trap Imperialism. We do not require to look far to find instances of the sort of things that lead to great expenditure. We have the case of Somaliland, we have the case of Nigeria, and we have now the case of Tibet. We all know exactly how it comes about. The man on the spot, full of zeal and full of public spirit, full of knowledge from his own point of view, and deeply impressed with the importance of that which is immediately before him, but possibly with no perspective and no view of wider considerations, urges on the Minister at home to take a certain step either against a tribe or against an individual, or whatever else it may be. There is an excuse for some hostile or strong action. He is refused, but he insists, and, if he insists long enough, he knows that the people with whom he is dealing will ultimately yield to his importunity. The same process is set up between the Minister and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and again we have the Chancellor of the Exchequer standing firm and whispering, or doing more than whispering, perhaps using very strong expressions, to convey the idea that he will not consent, but finally consenting. And then we have the Prime Minister, as controller of the general policy of the Government, all on the side of peace, but, on the other hand, daily and weekly, in his new capacity as director-general of the naval and military affairs of the country, always hearing the other side, the side which tends to action; and then it probably ends in permission being given to take the step that is recommended. But it must only be the first step. Never, never, never will they agree to anything more. Then, in one case after another, we at home, in our melancholy way, see the result. Circumstances have the mastery over us. You cannot stop. You must go on. Your prestige is involved. You might as well command the waters of Niagara to be still. Over you must go. Engagements have to be accepted and acted on which commit the country to responsibilities and burdens which were never dreamed of. And how much is this sort of thing likely to be increased when we have Ministers at home who are known to encourage this forward spirit in different parts of the Empire, and when the man on the spot, as I have called him, knows that he has at least one or two powerful assistants within the Cabinet itself?

Well, Sir, that is the cause of this large expenditure, that is the spirit of which I complain; but when we speak of expenditure and deplore it, then it is said that it is all nonsense to denounce it, that the country can well afford it. The ability to pay has nothing to do with the justice or the necessity of the demand. I believe that the Eastern, the Oriental, fiscal method is to say, "Here is a taxable matter, let us tax it. Here is a man with money, let us take some of it from him." But that has never yet been our way. Our principle has been to take only what was strictly required for public purposes. It is largely due to the watchfulness exercised over expenditure and the adoption of such fiscal methods as will best suit the interests of the people, that the wealth of the country, which is being cut to pieces by taxation, has increased, and that its commerce has greatly developed. Therefore we should be suspicious of excuses such as that the country does not feel the pinch or that the taxation will be of a painless character, like painless dentistry. This House is in the position of a trustee. We are bound to see that no expenditure is incurred which we are not satisfied will be wise and necessary. This is a truism, but it is apt to be overlooked. But can the country afford it? What do you mean by the country? If you mean the whole wealth of the country, then it is easy to show that the expenditure will diminish it by only such and such a percentage. But that has nothing to do with it. Who are the classes and individuals who pay? The men with small incomes; the men with low and precarious wages; the family of slender resources, where every increase of price is felt. They may be able still to get their necessaries, but if they get them at a higher price they have to lose certain comforts which they had before. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham last year made the announcement, as I understood, that he intended to visit a large number of cottages in order to prove to the working classes by means of a table, that the working man would gain by an extended system of indirect taxation. I do not know whether that tour has yet been made. The right hon. Gentleman was busy in the winter, and we are glad to know that he has been recovering his health in the spring. But now the summer has, as it seems, set in, and it would be a good time to make that tour. If there is any advantage in such a series of domiciliary visits, why should not the Chancellor of the Exchequer also visit these cottages—they cover many square miles in this country? The right hon. Gentleman might not find that the inmates were consuming less sugar, or less tea, or even less tobacco, but they will have a smaller sum to lay out upon other things, and there must be a corresponding loss to the home trade. The payers of income-tax, too, would have a story to tell of painful economies they have to set on foot, and these again are prejudicial to trade. It is ridiculous and it is the purest nonsense to pretend that the question is disposed of by the statement that the country is able to afford it, and that 50 millions of extra taxation can be levied without causing inconvenience, suffering, and depression of trade, and that of those 50 millions 40 can be sunk in unproductive expenditure without damage to trade and employment.

And now I come to another point, and I am glad to tell the House it is my last. This Bill has for its sponsors a Government pledged to great changes in our fiscal system, and the main doctrine upon which that system has hitherto rested is to be deleted, annulled, in fact, obliterated altogether. More than that, they are overshadowed and dominated by fiscal projects of an even wider character than those they openly profess. As sponsors for the Finance Bill they enlarge on the prosperity of the country as able to bear the additional burden of 50 millions a year; as fiscal reformers they enlarge on the serious condition of trade and the scarcity and precariousness of employment. Let them be careful to attribute effects to their true causes. Expenditure is a vital factor in fiscal policy, as the use which has been made of the present scale of expenditure in the fiscal agitation has shown. What said the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham last week? "We have," he said, "a new issue altogether; we have to find a great revenue by taxation, and I want to raise that revenue as far as possible from the pockets of foreigners." Now what does this mean? I am not going into the merits of the policy itself, but what does it mean? That fiscal reform is to be an alternative to economy, that the country is to go on squandering money, but it is to be under a system of fresh taxation, of lucrative taxation, taxes paid by other people, taxes which hurt nobody and bless everybody. That is the only alternative policy that holds the field against a policy of retrenchment, and for the advocates of high expenditure it may not be ill designed. It may, perhaps, account for the easy financial methods of the Government. But from our point of view the exploiting of expenditure in this fashion is one of the gravest dangers of the financial situation. When we give credit to the Government for a Budget which in the main—there are blemishes in it I know—but which is in the main a free-trade Budget, we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that, on the other side of the account, fiscal reformers desire, and proclaim the desire, to use it as a means to hold free trade to ransom. This is the reason for which I ask the House at this stage to agree to this Amendment and to declare with a strong voice against extravagant expenditure.

Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out from the word 'That' to the end of the Question, in order to add the words 'this House, having regard to the heavy burden of taxation proposed by this Bill in a time of peace, deems it necessary to declare its condemnation of the large and continuous increase of the national expenditure in recent years.'"—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

*The FINANCIAL SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY (Mr. VICTOR CAVENDISH, Derbyshire, W.) said the right hon. Gentleman had traversed a large area in the course of his speech, but such comparisons of expenditure as he had made were not very useful. He proceeded on the assumption that up to 1895, the last year when the right hon. Gentleman and his friends were responsible for finance, expenditure was above reproach, and since then it had fallen away and offered unfavourable comparison. Of course, it must be admitted that since that year expenditure had increased, and to a considerable degree; but it must be remembered in what condition the right hon. Gentleman and his Party left the national defences. The present Government had often been blamed for what had been called want of foresight in preparing for the Boer war, but in the three or four years before the outbreak of war they were able to do an immense amount of preparation for such emergencies as might occur. Did the right hon. Gentleman really imagine that the condition of our naval and military forces was, when he left office, suitable for facing war of any sort or kind? In instituting a comparison this side of the account must be looked at. Under those circumstances he did not think the Opposition had any ground for taunting the Government with not pursuing a policy of retrenchment. He did not think that their policy, prior to the outbreak of the war, could be accurately described by the term extravagance. He was justified in saying that the policy of attempting to avoid war from the fear of being accused of an agressive policy had been carried to a dangerous extent. There was every reason at the present time for saying the country was able to bear the burden imposed, heavy though it was and severely though it pressed on some classes, and the needs of the country must be taken into consideration. Upon this the right hon. Gentleman had nothing to say. The right hon. Gentleman accused the Government simply of piling up huge armaments, both naval and military, but he did not deal with their national needs and necessities. He gave the Government good advice as to acting in friendly relations with other countries, and congratulated the Government on the success which had attended their recent efforts in that direction, but he did not allude to that strength of position which was favourable to friendly agreements and commanded respect. Were they not now in a better position, without any wish to appear aggressive, to be able to make those friendly agreements of which he had spoken? They had no wish to use that force or to boast of their strength, but by being strong they were able to earn respect and, he hoped, the genuine friendship of other countries. Did the right hon. Gentleman mean that we should avoid doing anything in Somaliland or Tibet in order to avoid the possibility of hostilities?

The right hon. Gentleman confined his criticisms to naval and military expenditure, and he scarcely alluded to the other portions of national expenditure. There were, however, a few matters to which he should like to direct the attention of the House. At the beginning of his speech the Leader of the Opposition said there was a wave of extravagance in regard to expenditure going over the country, and he seemed to think that that was due to the fact that the Government had taken the view that it was necessary to spend a considerable amount of money upon the Army and Navy. He did not believe that in the past sufficient attention had ever been given to putting the defensive forces of this country upon a better scientific basis. They saw now a systematic attempt being made for the first time to co-ordinate the two great forces of the Empire. The right hon. Gentleman did not refer at any length to the Civil Service Estimates or suggest extravagant expenditure was taking place there. It was his privilege as Secretary to the Treasury to have, perhaps, more correspondence with Members than any other Minister, and from all sources he was in the habit of receiving almost daily suggestions that were certainly not in the direction of economy. Hon. Gentlemen wrote to him advising increase of wages to Government employees, expenditure on manuscripts, or for the preservation of ancient monuments, or for better provision for the comfort of the people, and much of his time was spent in writing politely but firmly to decline undertaking further expenditure. He did not believe there was anybody in the House, outside the Treasury Bench, who not only preached economy but made some effort to practise it. He was not going to refer to all that had happened through the session, but he would refer to what took place during three days last week. On Wednesday it was proposed that they should pay themselves. On Thursday they spent the whole day discussing the Post Office Estimates; he was in the House most of the time. Not a single word was said in the course of that debate in favour of economy or retrenchment. It was one succession of representations from both sides of the House to his right hon. friend the Postmaster-General that this or that postal facility ought to be given. On Friday last a proposal was brought before the House that the country should undertake another large amount of expenditure on lighthouses. The only word of warning came from the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Bristol, who pointedly asked hon. and right hon. Gentlemen on the Opposition side of the House if they were going to vote in favour of putting this extra charge on the Imperial taxes on Friday, and if they were going to support the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman to-day. He did not think it fair or right that the Government should take all the blame to itself. He was not going to give statistics, but if hon. Gentlemen would go through the debates which had taken place from time to time on Bills which had been introduced by private Members, they would see that there had been almost constantly a demand for additional expenditure. Personally, on Saturday morning when he came to consider the work which had been done during the course of the week by the House of Commons, he gave a sigh of relief if the Government had not been forced to add some further expenditure to the Imperial finance. He did not mean to say, or to suggest, that hon. and right hon. Gentlemen should not bring those matters before the House. No doubt they were matters of importance, and no doubt if there was money available it might be usefully applied to these purposes. He wished at the same time, when they were bringing these Bills and Resolutions before the House, they would bear in mind their own most admirable economic maxims on the occasions when the Budget Resolutions were being discussed. When the Budget Resolutions were being considered recently they heard a great many criticisms, and no doubt in the course of this debate they would hear a great many more, but he wished that hon. Gentlemen would take a little more note of some of their own speeches, and that, instead of pressing certain views on the Gentlemen sitting on the Treasury Bench, they would spend a little time in sending extracts from their own speeches to the correspondents who were continually pressing demands upon them.

He would say to the right hon. Gentleman when he brought up this matter of economy in the form of the Amendment now before the House that he ought also to bring it up on the discussion of the Estimates. The House had made certain alterations in the rules of procedure during the last few years, and he thought he was rightly interpreting the wish of the Prime Minister when he said it was his right hon. friend's desire that on Thursday, which was allocated to Supply, the Votes brought forward should be chosen by the House as a whole, and by the Opposition in particular. Time after time he had appealed to his hon. friend the Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury to let him know what Supply was wanted for certain Thursdays. It was really no exaggeration to say that his hon. friend who was responsible for the business of the House had almost to go round begging hon. Gentlemen to tell him what Supply was wanted. Except possibly during the discussion of the Army Estimates there had scarcely at any time been a symptom of a general desire to reduce expenditure. On the contrary, the whole tendency shown in Supply was towards increasing the expenditure. He did not wish to press this point too strongly, but he ventured to say that nobody more than his right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer would welcome the support of the Leader of the Opposition, when the Estimates were before the House, in getting hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite to assist in the direction of economy. The right hon. Gentleman had said in connection with the debates in Committee of Supply that they had, of course, not got the materials which were in possession of the Government Departments in framing the Votes. He himself understood that that was exactly what Committee of Supply was for—that was to say, it was intended that in the debates in Committee of Supply the Minister responsible for the Vote should be criticised and examined, and that he should have an opportunity of defending the proposed expenditure. The right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition had said that they were not prepared to discuss the Navy in any hostile spirit. He did put in a few words of warning with which nobody would disagree, but it was a most remarkable fact that when the Estimates were discussed in the few hours before half-past seven they were able to run through all the Navy Votes with the exception of one which was left outstanding in order that it might be discussed later on.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: How many days discussion had gone on before?

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): Three days.

*MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH: Well, there were three days, but he did not think that could be taken as indicating a great wish to discuss the details of expenditure in public. If the House did not wish to attack the proposals of the Government he was sure that he should be the last to do so.

MR. LOUGH: We did attack them.

*MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH said hon. Members were not so ready when Supply was put down for discussion as they were on the Second Reading of the Finance Bill to talk about economy.

MR. LOUGH: We tried to knock out two churches.

*MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH said that if in stating their views as to how economy should be effected hon. Members opposite could only attempt to knock out two churches on the Navy Estimates, the policy of the Government was not one which could be seriously attacked. He hoped that during the present debate the Government would hear more definitely what their sins in the direction of extravagance had been, and also that hon. Members opposite would give a clear declaration of their policy, because, after all, it was nothing else except a matter of policy. [AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!] He admitted it. He hoped that they would have an equally frank admission from the other side, and if they could show a policy which, with greater economy, would do all that the country considered necessary to meet the requirements of the public service and to preserve the defences of the Empire, he should be very much surprised indeed if they were able to show much retrenchment. He could assure the House that the Government realised the importance of economic management and administration, and that they would be glad to receive the help of the House itself in the exercise of economy.

SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) said there was one sentence in the good-humoured speech of the hon. Member which he was afraid most of them heard with deep regret. While professing to answer the statement of the Leader of the Opposition that the policy of the Government had in some cases been unduly aggressive, the hon. Member went out of his way to apply that statement to one case only, namely, the South African War. The hon. Member said if there was fault to be found with their South African policy it was that it had not been sufficiently aggressive. He would be out of order if he went into the South African War policy, but surely they might be allowed to remind the House of the Jameson Raid. On the subject that was really before the House the Financial Secretary to the Treasury attacked the predecessors of the Government for having in 1895 left the naval and military services of the country in an abnormal condition. Now as regarded the Navy every statement made at that time, on either side of the House, was that the Spencer programme was sufficient and proper under the circumstances of the day; and, as regarded the military side, he appealed to hon. Members who were interested to read the Report of the War Commission to see what they made of the Prime Minister's assertion that the Army before the South African War had been brought up to a proper condition—he meant as regarded stores. In two speeches on that subject the Prime Minister had said that the condition of the Army in 1896 had been satisfactory.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: That is your view of what I said.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said that the Prime Minister's statement was to the effect that, by the efforts of the predecessors of his Government, the defences of the country had been left in an adequate condition. That was the fact.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No; you are quite wrong.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said that as to stores, the Prime Minister had, on repeated occasions, said that at last the condition of the stores was satisfactory; but the Report of the War Commission showed that that condition had up to 1902 still been unsatisfactory, and the strongest possible language was used on that subject by them. The entire expenditure, amounting to £11,000,000, for bringing up the reserve of stores had been approved by all sides of the House, but that did not affect current or year by year expenditure to the present time. The Financial Secretary to the Treasury also claimed that the present Government for the first time recently, had reduced the management of the Army and Navy to a scientific basis; that, for the first time, the Army and Navy services had been co-ordinated. Exactly the same claim was made in 1896. One of the main charges of extravagance and bad administration was that only now, under the new arrangements that had been made by the Government, the economy was to be achieved which ought to have been successfully made before, but which, as a matter of fact, did not appear on the present Estimates. The Financial Secretary to the Treasury spoke in a chastened spirit about the expenditure of the Government, and tried to throw the whole blame on the House of Commons. It was hardly characteristic of a strong Government having the support of the House of Commons, to complain of letters which were received in favour of particular expenditure on London parks, etc. The House of Commons had to look to larger questions in a larger way, and the Government ought to resist the pressure from individual Members.

The Financial Secretary to the Treasury represented, he understood, the free-trade section of the Treasury, and he was not open to the suggestion made by the Leader of the Opposition as to the effect of fiscal policy on the financial control to be exercised by the Government. They all knew that protectionism tended towards public waste, and against efficiency in finance. The hon. Gentleman attacked the House of Commons individually and collectively. He attacked the House as though the Opposition, as a body, had supported the Lighthouse Dues Bill. Now the hon. Gentleman must know that in past years, when the condition of the finances of the country was very different from what it was now, some members of the Opposition had supported that demand for the abolition of the lighthouse dues, thinking that there was no more reason why the shipping community should be charged for these light dues than all members of the community should be charged individually for the lights outside their houses. Yet those same Members on this occasion had either walked out like himself, or even voted against the Bill solely on account of the state of national finance. This question would have to be considered in a wider spirit than that in which it was considered by the Financial Secretary to the Treasury, and all of them ought to be on their marrow bones and take their share of the blame for excessive expenditure. He should have thought that in a debate of this sort each side ought to have made large admissions to one another. He knew that it was not considered wise to make admissions, because they might be quoted against hon. Members in future debates; but, on the whole, he suggested that it was wiser to take a subject fairly and make all due admissions, and that the Government, in order to obtain support, should likewise make due admissions. He took it that hon. Gentleman on the other side of the House had been trying to admit that the present Government had been extravagant. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had been trying to maintain that the Government had not been extravagant. He was alone in that opinion. It was not shared by his predecessors even, on his own side. The right hon. Member for West Bristol made speech after speech to his constituents, in which he made that statement as emphatically as it could be made. A right hon. Gentleman opposite shook his head, but he preferred to take the statement of the right hon. Member for West Bristol, although it must be said that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Bristol's statement was somewhat stronger than was due to loyalty to his collective responsibility. They all admitted—it was impossible to deny—that as regarded Army expenditure, the Government, by not knowing their own mind, by changing their system from time to time, had been extravagant.

There was another matter on which there should be admissions. It was that the fiscal policy of the country must affect this question of extravagence. It did so elsewhere. But when they had 120 Members on the other side of the House who were most emphatic in giving a kind of support to the Government, and who said that they had the support of the constituencies behind them, who were in favour of raising an average 10 per cent. duty upon all foreign-manufactured goods, who claimed that the tax would be paid by the foreigners, that in itself that duty would be a blessing to the country—these hon. Members would not be actively interested in economy as some other hon. Members would be. It used to be a complaint that some Chancellors of the Exchequer spoke of the Consolidated Fund as like manna which fell from heaven. But these proposed import duties were to be more than manna. Hon. Members opposite had discovered a new heavenly blessing, a new fund, a new source of revenue, which they thought they would be able to spend with perfect freedom. He believed that two more admissions might be made on the other side.

Was there any control over South African finance, over the finance of Lord Milner which affected the finance of this country? The Leader of the Opposition pointed out that the Government was managed from the outside in one direction; he wished to make the same remark but that it was managed from the outside in another direction. The grand elector of the Government was outside the Government; and he was more powerful than the Government. That elector raised a case, the basis of which rested upon the taxation which did not tend in the direction of a reduction of expenditure. There used to be a Portuguese Minister in this country, who, although accredited to the Court of St. James, used sometimes to take a steamer to Lisbon, and there turn out a Government, appoint a Government in its place and then re-appoint himself as Portuguese Minister to London. Here the right hon. Member for West Birmingham could do that if he pleased. The Government was dominated by the right hon. Gentleman, somewhat unconstitutionally, on this fiscal question; and therefore it could not be trusted to insist on that careful administration of the finances of the country which the Constitution demanded. Coming to details, the Financial Secretary to the Treasury attacked the House of Commons for their treatment of the Navy Estimates; and he complained that the House of Commons had passed these Estimates in the course of one afternoon. But what were the facts? Every Member knew that the naval expenditure was entirely governed by the first Vote, Vote A, and the Shipbuilding Vote; and after they had had full discussion on Vote A, it was only on churches, chaplains, and such like, that they could hope to effect any reductions. There was a full discussion on Vote A, but the Vote for the Navy, from its popularity as being the first line of defence of this country, had not the same opposition in these debates as the Vote for the Army. At any rate, there was a very full debate this year, and a portion of the Shipbuilding Vote was kept over with the understanding that there would be a similarly full discussion in relation to it in July.

Those were admissions which hon. Gentlemen opposite should make; but there were also admissions which Radical Members ought to make in regard to national expenditure. One admission they ought to make was that they should not attack a mere increase of expenditure without reason and without understanding. They should not attack an increase without examination. He thought, as the Chancellor of the Exchequer had stated, that they might expect an increase, not only an increase in proportion to the increase of population, but greater. Some thought the household occupier voters more extravagant than the £10 householders of 1832. He doubted the Tory Party began their appeal to the new voters of 1867, the question submitted being in 1869 "who starved the cats." The cats belonged to the dockyards and victualling-yards; and their allowance was cut down from 8d. a week to 4d. Mr. Gladstone pointed out that a question of efficiency was involved, because the cats were kept to eat mice, and that, therefore, a reduction in their allowance would be likely to secure a diminution in the number of mice. That was the first question put before the new electors by the Conservative Party. As to the wage questions alluded to by the Secretary to the Treasury, there appeared to be a belief on the part of the hon. Gentleman, and also on the part of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, that any agitation in regard to the wages of Government employees was a dishonest agitation fomented by Members directly interested. There was more than that in it. There was a belief that the Government ought to set an example in those matters; and many hon. Members who had strenuously set forward that claim were those who did not represent the constituencies immediately concerned. Radicals, Labour Members, and Socialists would be stronger in the next Parliament; and they would be all in favour of higher activity in the functions of the State. It would be open to the Chancellor of the Exchequer to contend that those efforts would tend in the direction of increased expenditure. Those were admissions they should all make. There was no wickedness in the matter; it was a question of scientific administration. Just as the fiscal reformers had a new fund so had the Radicals also a new fund on which to draw. The Local Authorities Taxation Bill would give a new source of revenue to the State; for it would replace the wasteful expenditure under the present doles to local authorities and to that extent save the Exchequer.

When they had admitted all that, what did the Amendment before the House assert? It declared that there was a great increase in recent expenditure, and he thought that it was specially directed against the recent increase in the national expenditure having regard to what the country got for it. It should, however, be remembered that one of the great causes of the increase in national expenditure in recent years had been the swing given to expenditure as the result of the South African War; and for his part he had always thought in the present state of the national life of the country, with rivals pressing upon it, with America coming rapidly to the front, and with Germany with 60,000,000 of well-educated people competing with it, that it was national lunacy to spend £200,000,000 in buying a white elephant in South Africa. But he admitted on the other hand that up to the present time the increased expenditure on the Fleet was one which was proper as long as the Kaiser was telling the world that he was trying to knock this country off its perch and willing to engage with two other Powers against it. The course taken with regard to naval expenditure was one which no Government could avoid; but now a change had taken place owing to the circumstances which had been alluded to; and undoubtedly some improvement might be looked forward to in the future. Making all those admissions, however, he alleged that as regarded military expenditure there was an overwhelming case of waste against the present Government. Even now the Government admitted that a large reduction in Army expenditure ought to take place; but they did not make it.

To his mind, one of the difficulties in this debate was that they could not dwell unduly on examples from one partcular class of Estimates without being out of order; but he would wish to give an instance of the want of continuity in military policy which had occurred in South Africa. The first plan was the plan of the South African Constabulary. It was entirely a South African plan, after being once started in this Parliament; and was to be maintained from South African sources. Then arose the inability of the present Government to cope with Lord Milner's finance, and the result was that the British Army, to its great detriment and to the diminution of its efficiency, was now discharging the duties which ought to have been performed by the South African Constabulary. Money had been spent in hutments in the Northern Transvaal, but owing to the unhealthiness of the district the troops had to be removed and money was lost. The result was that there had been not only waste, but that the efficiency of the Army had been impaired; and that process was still in progress. Again, it was said that the garrison regiments were only needed for Gibraltar and Malta; but after a considerable sum of money had been spent, the garrison regiments were hustled off to South Africa. As regarded Somaliland, the Secretary to the Treasury was apologetic, and said that, in his opinion, the Government could not have acted otherwise. The hon. Gentleman defended the expedition, but the Government had brought it to an end without having achieved its object; in contradiction to the speech of the Secretary of State for War, less than a week before. That was a condemnation of the whole course of the policy on which the expedition was based. The expedition was condemned in the House of Commons on information supplied by Ministers themselves; and there was this difference between the Somaliland case and every other case, that Somaliland was officially admitted to be a totally worthless country, so that it was quite impossible for this country to ever recover its money. The Chancellor of the Exchequer during the debates on the Budget not only maintained that there had been no extravagance, but he said that in all those cases the country had got its money back; but in the Somaliland case there was absolutely no possibility of the country ever getting its money back.

The Leader of the Opposition said one very true thing among the many true things he said in his speech when he stated that wasteful expenditure always meant inefficiency. That could be proved in the case of the Army. Owing to want of continuity of policy in South Africa the troops there were now dispersed, and that was destructive to efficiency and fatal to discipline. The Chancellor of the Exchequer said that he did not think it was right that the House of Commons having assented to a certain military programme should complain of the expenditure. It was true that the House of Commons had assented to military programmes, each of which was inconsistent with the other, and all of which caused inefficiency and waste. How could the House give guidance to the Government? All that it could do it did do. It had a programme presented at its head suddenly with the assent, by telegram, of Lord Roberts and the assent of the right hon. Gentleman the present Secretary of State for India, and the whole Opposition and a great many Members on the Government side voted against it. It was now admitted that those Members were right. No one now said a word against them. The censure passed on that programme by the Report of the Committee of three to which the Prime Minister assented was the strongest censure that had ever been passed by anybody. The most essential part of the programme, the mixing together of the Auxiliary and Regular portions of the Army, had been absolutely abandoned. Another few days would see another scheme before the House, and the present scheme would be abandoned for ever. What could the House of Commons do which they did not do? What they could they said and did. The Army represented to the country the subject upon which there had been the most difficulty; on which the Government might have obtained the greatest credit if they had brought in a well-considered scheme of reform, but on which the failure of the Government had been greatest. At the present time the Estimates the House were asked to pass were taking unnecessary money from the taxpayer. The Government had said that next year they would be able to make a great reduction in military expenditure. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Croydon when Chancellor of the Exchequer had said it could be promised within two years. But that was a death-bed repentance, having regard to what the right hon. Member for West Birmingham had said on Thursday last. He admitted that those who disagreed with the expenditure of the Government ought to show in what way economy could be practised and where there had been extravagance. He contended that this Army scheme was a concrete instance of extravagance and that the saving which was promised next year ought to have been given years ago. There had been steady opposition to the policy of delay which had been going on for several years past, and for which the country had had to pay year after year. They had protested against these extensions of the Empire and prophesied the evils they were bound to bring in their train. Those who had opposed the war, these extensions of Empire in Africa, and the Somali policy, and who had supported the reduction of men in the Army Estimates, could fairly support this Amendment.

The Leader of the Opposition had spoken of the amounts shown in the Estimates for the two services. The Navy was officially considered to cost £42,000,000, although in reality it only cost £41,500,000. The cost of the Army —of the land defence of the British Empire—was overwhelmingly greater. It was no less than £55,000,000, of which £35,000,000 was the expenditure here at home on Army, and £20,000,000 in India and from the Civil Service Estimates, because it must not be forgotten that there was war expenditure on the Civil Service Estimates. There was room for a great reduction of expenditure in this item, and if the Administration had been a strong one it would have been made long since. The Estimates were taking money unnecessarily from the pockets of the taxpayer. He should vote heartily for the Amendment because it had, in his opinion, been proved that there had been great extravagance under the present Government, and because of what the House had been told he believed that that extravagance was likely to continue.

Mr. HAYES FISHER (Fulham) said that while admitting that expenditure had so enormously and so very rapidly increased that it was a matter of grave national concern, he denied that the Government was to be blamed for that expenditure. Still further did he deny that if hon. Gentlemen opposite were in the position of governing the country even as much as £1,000 would be struck off it. There was no doubt a tendency to spend money on Imperial defence, armaments, and naval development, most of which had been fully justified; on the other hand there was a desire to lavish money on the hundred and one little things which went to swell the national expenditure. When at the Treasury he had the honour of framing the Estimates for the year 1903–4, in doing which he had taken the trouble to make a note of the demands made upon him during the short period he was in office, and he came to the conclusion then that with the support of the Chancellor of the Exchequer he might have had £2,000,000 a year for very different objects to those for which it was applied. The right hon. Gentleman opposite had stated that Mr. Gladstone at one time said: "The spirit of Empire is abroad." It was the same with national, municipal, parochial, and private expenditure. Everybody was extravagant; they ordered things whether they could pay for them or not, and trusted that the Lord or the Chancellor of the Exchequer would provide. As a vote of censure had been moved on the Government, it was germane to consider the growth of municipal expenditure which had been controlled, not by the Government, but largely by gentlemen belonging to the Party opposite. In twenty years the national expenditure had increased by 50 per cent. Who did not know areas of local government in which there had been an increase of 50 per cent. in the expenditure — areas in which twenty years ago the rates were 5s. in the £, and were now 7s. 6d? Then there were the municipal borrowings, which, as revealed by the Return lately issued, were quite as serious a menace to our financial stability as any of the expenditure which had been so much animadverted upon in the course of the debate. Lord Welby, who had recently resented the criticisms of the Chancellor of the Exchequer on the expenditure of the London County Council, was himself the first to call attention to the fact that that body was outstepping the bounds of prudence. He was not attacking the London County Council, he was merely giving it as an example of how municipal bodies had been forced by the weight of public opinion to borrow and to spend large sums of money, sometimes on remunerative, but too often on unremunerative works. Economy was of no value at all as an election cry for Parliament, county council, or any other body. Whether the time was coming when the people would begin to feel the pinch of the heavy taxation rendered necessary by the expenditure for which they had so gladly voted he could not say, but, at all events, no regard for economy could be seen at present among the electors.

The right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean had found fault with the Financial Secretary to the Treasury for imputing to Members of the House of Commons a great deal of the blame for the increased expenditure. But it was not only his hon. friend who held that view. In the year 1903 a Select Committee was appointed to devise, if possible, some better means of controlling national expenditure through the House of Commons. That Committee, which examined many distinguished witnesses, such as Lord Welby, Sir Francis Mowatt, Sir George Murray, and others, stated in their Report—

> "Eight witnesses who had had special opportunities of noticing the effect of discussions in the Committee of the House of Commons on Supply, gave it as their opinion that for many years past the result was to urge increased, not decreased, expenditure."

The whole of the evidence went to show that since Mr. Gladstone was a great power in the House a different spirit had prevailed, and that the result of discussion nowadays was to increase rather than diminish expenditure. Where could any barrier be looked for? There was none to be found in public opinion. He had no valuable suggestions to make, but he thought Ministers of the Crown, especially the Prime Minister and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, would have to develop a high moral and political courage, and refuse the demands constantly made by their colleagues for increased expenditure. It was no good the Secretary to the Treasury saying "No" if he was not backed up by the Chancellor of the Exchequer; nor was it any use for the Secretary to the Treasury and the Chancellor of the Exchequer to say "No" unless they were backed up in their refusal by the Prime Minister and the Cabinet. Every Minister naturally desired to glorify and magnify his own Department, but it was highly necessary that the Prime Minister and the Chancellor of the Exchequer should review the expenditure of the country as a whole. The development of our protectorates, for instance, was more of a missionary than a commercial enterprise, and he could not help thinking that over the shores of East and West Africa we ought to write *festina lente*. He had never objected to the development of those portions of Africa, but he thought we ought to be careful how far we went into the hinterland, and see how much revenue we might expect in return for the expenditure we incurred.

The Financial Secretary who refused the demands of Departmental Ministers was not popular, but no Financial Secretary or Chancellor of the Exchequer should expect to be altogether popular with other Departments. The House of Commons itself ought to take more trouble to review the expenditure. Through the Select Committee on National Expenditure he suggested that each Estimate should have attached to it a table showing the decennial growth of that particular Estimate, so that the increase, instead of being concealed, should be conspicuously revealed, and he believed that suggestion was being adopted. There was really no proper stated occasion on which the whole expenditure of the country could be reviewed. The Budget discussions were a series of Party fights, which afforded admirable opportunities for the worst kind of Party recrimination but did not give opportunities for really valuable criticism. It would be much better to have even one stated occasion for a general review of expenditure than to fritter away their energies on so many useless discussions. It was doubtless true that expenditure in the main depended on policy and policy on the Government, but there was a large field in which the House of Commons itself might so review methods of expenditure as to ensure greater efficiency and economy. The establishment of a new "Estimates Committee" had been suggested, but he doubted whether any such Committee would effect a decrease of expenditure, because, inasmuch as expenditure largely depended on policy, the Committee would find that it could touch only the vegetables, while the real joint of policy was beyond its reach. All were anxious to reduce expenditure, or, if that were impossible, to get the utmost value for the money we spent, but when one analysed the expenditure and asked where money could be saved, a satisfactory answer was difficult to find. During the last twenty years Civil Service expenditure had increased only in proportion to the population, and the greater part of the increase was in the Vote for Education. In these days of fierce competition would anyone propose to reduce the expenditure on education? Administration was, he believed, becoming expensive, and possibly some saving might be made in that direction, but whereas administration might account for thousands, it should not be forgotten that it was policy that was responsible for millions. He doubted, too, whether the Party opposite would face the unpopularity involved in any reduction of grants-in-aid.

By far the larger portion of the increase of expenditure was undoubtedly due to armaments. During the last twenty years our expenditure on the Army had doubled, and he was one of those who had an uneasy feeling as to whether we were getting full value for the money. On the other hand, he had great hopes that the new Defence Committee, when it correlated the expenditure on the Army and on the Navy, would succeed in getting a better Army than we now possessed for considerably less money. It was on the land and not at sea that he expected to see expenditure reduced. The Government hoped that in a short time the result of the deliberations of the Defence Committee would effect economies in the Army without diminishing its efficiency. He should personally deprecate any proposal that the expenditure on the Navy ought to be reduced. It was quite true that, since 1883, they had more than quadrupled their expenditure upon the Navy. In that year they only spent £10,000,000 on the Navy, but he was sure that that was a period of peril which none of them desired to go back to. The Navy expenditure gradually increased from 1886 to 1892, but did the members of the present Opposition when they came into power reduce those Estimates? What did Lord Spencer do when he was First Lord of the Admiralty? Why, he entered upon the biggest shipbuilding programme ever submitted to the Parliament of this country, and in two years the Party opposite, under the guidance of Lord Spencer, raised the Navy Estimate by £4,500,000. Since that time there had been a vast increase of this Empire and its commerce, and a great growth of colonial and Imperial aspirations. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Montrose, speaking in 1899, said the real operative force in our success in regard to Fashoda was that France was conscious of her own maritime inferiority. The fact that the Government of that day and the Government in which Lord Spencer was First Lord of the Admiralty had expended large sums upon the Fleet of this country no doubt saved them from a terrible war. He did not believe that the people of this country grudged the money which had been spent upon the Navy, and they did not want to return to the state of things in the early eighties when one Admiral described our Fleet as "a menagerie of curious but ill-assorted vessels;" and another Admiral said he was in command of a vessel which was rotten to the core, and which could neither fight nor run away. Although reductions might be made here and there by a proper control and a general review of the whole system of expenditure, he did not believe the country would be justified, as long as Germany was building at the rate she was, in reducing its expenditure upon the Navy. Just as the Japanese were ready to die for their country, the people of this country were ready to pay for the preservation of this Empire. Better times were coming, and one of the glories of this country would be that the sons and daughters of this Empire would readily give their contribution to this great expenditure which the country was called upon to incur for the maintenance of the British Navy.

*MR. McCRAE (Edinburgh, E.) said the hon. Member opposite had stated that the present Government could not be held responsible for this great increase in the expenditure. The present Government, and that Government alone, were responsible for the expenditure of the country. Even the Secretary to the Treasury admitted that responsibility, and in the most pleasing manner he stood forth as the champion of economy in the smaller details of expenditure. The hon. Member had also asserted that this expenditure had placed our defensive forces on a scientific basis. That word "scientific" sounded strangely familiar. They had heard a good deal about scientific taxation, but that was the basis upon which they were told the six Army Corps scheme, which was part of this expenditure, was to be placed, but which had now been declared to be of no service whatever. Through the whole speech of the Secretary to the Treasury there was no reference to the grave condition of our national expenditure at the present time, although he twitted the Opposition with urging upon the Government increased expenditure in the smaller details of the services. That was a very cheap sneer, but it did not at all go to the root of the matter. The right hon. Baronet the Member for Berwick said that this Government was parsimonious in thousands but profligate in millions. While the Government objected to the Bill which was passed for the relief of the shipping trade, they forgot that that relief would be very small in comparison with what was done by the Agricultural Rating Act, which gave £2,500,000 a year in doles to the landlords. The same objection which he had taken to the speech of the Secretary to the Treasury also applied to the various speeches they had had from the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who had left the impression upon the House that he had not fully realised the gravity of our financial position, and he had made no attempt to grapple with a reduction of the expenditure after the conclusion of the war. As his right hon. friend had pointed out, a reduction in the expenditure was made after Waterloo, and the Crimean War, but the present Government had made no attempt to reduce the enormous expenditure which had been growing up in what in sarcasm had been called the 'ordinary" expenditure. That expenditure, in round figures, had now reached £143,000,000 whereas in 1894–95 it was £94,000,000 or an increase of nearly £50,000,000. But that was not the whole case. The expenditure was increasing enormously, and that it was appalling was admitted even by right hon. Gentlemen opposite. In the discussion on the Budget on the 19th of last month, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Bristol, whose experience at the Treasury they all recognised, admitted that the present expenditure was extravagant, and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Croydon, in his Budget speech last year, termed our expenditure not only extravagant but reckless. The fact of the matter was that this evil was hereditary in any Conservative Government, and they had extravagant expenditure whenever there was a Conservative Government in power. The Secretary to the Treasury had asked them whether the state of matters in 1894 was an ideal state of expenditure. All he could say was that when the Liberal Government went out of office in 1895 they left a surplus of over £4,000,000 to their successors, and now after all these years with a Conservative Administration in power they had an increase in the expenditure of over £50,000,000 and a deficit of over £5,000,000.

He would like to consider the progressive nature of this expenditure under the present Government, for it had been increasing in a sort of compound interest ratio. If they compared the expenditure of 1897–98 with the expenditure under the Liberal Government in 1894–95 they would see that in those three years there had been an increase in the expenditure of £9,000,000 per annum. In the next three years they had an increase of £16,500,000 or an increase of £25,500,000 for the first six years of the present Administration. Take the three years from 1901 to 1904, excluding war expenditure, and they would find that the expenditure in 1901 was £119,000,000 in round figures, whilst in 1904 it was £146,000,000, or an increase in three years of £27,000,000. But that was not the whole case, because in addition to that expenditure there was the increase under the Naval and Military Works Acts and other capital expenditure. If they took that into account, and also the sum raised and given over to the local taxation account, they found that the comparison was as follows. The expenditure including the two items he had mentioned for the present year was estimated at £162,500,000, as compared with £102,000,000 in 1894–5, being an increase of £60,500,000. No doubt that increase had taken a little time to develop, but the Government had taken full advantage of the opportunity. This method of incurring capital expenditure and borrowing was a very serious one, and he thought that would be realised from the Report of the Public Accounts Committee which had recently been put into their hands. It was so important that with the permission of the House he would read the following passage from the Report—

> "Your Committee entertain serious doubts as to the financial method by which naval works are provided for by means of loans. The same remark applies, of course, to military works, and other similar loan services. For special works of permanent character and large cost, it may, as an exceptional measure, be desirable to provide by loan repayable within a limited number of years. But the resort to such procedure should be the exception, not the rule. In recent years, annual or biennial Military and Naval Works Acts have become a regular part of military and naval finance. Your Committee would deprecate the continuance of this practice. They believe that it would be more in accordance with sound rules of finance and would tend to simplify the national accounts and maintain an efficient control over expenditure if the bulk of these services were included as formerly in the annual Estimates.

The amount in the present year's Estimates under that head was £10,000,000, but even that sum was only an instalment of the total expenditure to which the House was committed. The House passed the other day a Bill to spend £3,000,000 on telephones. He wished the Chancellor of the Exchequer in his reply to give the House an idea of the expenditure to which the nation was committed under this head. The enormous growth of indebtedness could be realised when they considered that in the National Debt for the year just closed there was no less than £31,868,000 under the head of naval and military works, as compared with only £3,000,000 in 1894–5. This system could have only one result. It disguised to a certain extent our ordinary expenditure, and it enormously increased the National Debt. In 1904–5 the National Debt was £794,490,000, being an increase of £135,480,000 on the amount in 1894–5. The Chancellor of the Exchequer in his Budget speech said in respect of the dead-weight Debt—that was the Funded Debt, apart from these borrowings for naval and military works—that a sum had been laid aside to sinking fund by which they had reduced the Debt £5,149,000. Supposing that had been so, it would have been nothing to boast of, because he found that Mr. Gladstone in 1865–6, when the National Debt amounted to very much the same sum, said that the effective reduction of Debt amounted to £5,179,000, almost the same as the sum mentioned by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in his Budget speech last year. Mr. Gladstone also pointed out that of the total expenditure of that year the Debt charge amounted to 43 per cent. The Debt charge this year only amounted to 19 per cent. of our total expenditure. The Chancellor of the Exchequer did not make it quite clear that the reduction of £5,149,000 only applied to the dead-weight Debt, while on the other hand he was borrowing under the other heads of capital expenditure. If they excluded the money borrowed, and the Transvaal loan, they found that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had increased the Unfunded Debt by £4,298,000, leaving the net Debt reduction only £851,000 upon last year. Of course, the right hon. Gentleman claimed to have reduced it also by the £3,000,000 which we got out of the Transvaal loan, but that was only a very pleasing way of putting the matter, and when the House considered the method by which that sum was raised they would realise that it was not really an effective reduction of debt. It had been said that "mercy is twice blessed." These £3,000,000 had been twice borrowed. They were borrowed first of all to lend to the Transvaal. Borrowed again by the Transvaal to repay us by a loan guaranteed by ourselves: applied to the reduction of Debt for which we were really still responsible, as well as for the other £3,000,000 which the Chancellor of the Exchequer had put into his Exchequer balances. He wished to point out in regard to our national indebtedness that there was no sinking fund added in respect of the extra borrowings on account of the South African War. The addition to the National Debt charge was hardly sufficient to meet the increased interest in respect of the Debt, and no part of the Debt charge actually went as sinking fund for the increased expenditure due to the South African War. The Exchequer balances had been reduced to £4,600,000, as compared with £8,900,000 before the war. In 1864 Mr. Gladstone said that £7,352,000 was "an ample but an excessive amount." But the Exchequer balances should bear some proportion to the expenditure for the year, and the expenditure in 1864 was £67,000,000, against an expenditure this year of £143,000,000. The Exchequer balance should also bear some proportion to the charge for income-tax, otherwise large borrowings must be made to finance the Treasury during the lean periods of the year. Yet in 1864 the charge for income-tax with Exchequer balances at £7,000,000 was only £9,000,000. This year with Exchequer balances at £4,000,000 the charge for income-tax is £30,000,000.

With regard to the National Debt, the Chancellor of the Exchequer had not fairly stood up to his responsibilities, but had resorted to narrow and flimsy expedients in meeting a deficit, as he hoped to be able to show the House. No amount of explanation from the Chancellor of the Exchequer could get over the fact that he had met the deficit out of the Exchequer balances. How did he provide for the deficit? He had borrowed it out of the Exchequer balances, and he made a call on the unclaimed dividends to the amount of £1,000,000.

Attention called to the fact that forty Members were not present, House counted and forty Members being found present.

Mr. McCRAE said he was deeply grateful to the hon. Member for having given him a larger audience. He had shown that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had taken borrowed money to the extent of £2,288,000, and £1,000,000 from unclaimed dividends, but how did the right hon. Gentleman propose, according to his plan, to meet a balance of £1,500,000 when he only anticipated in his Budget a surplus of £730,000? Now, supposing that the surplus was much larger than he had estimated, the Chancellor of the Exchequer had no right whatever to that sum. Realised surpluses had always been looked upon as an addition to the sinking fund for the reduction of debt, and the right hon. Gentleman by looking forward to this anticipated surplus to increase his Exchequer balances, or to meet the deficit of last year, was making a gamble in futures, which was unsound finance. This policy of shifts and expedients was quite unworthy of a Chancellor of the Exchequer. He claimed that he had shown that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had not fairly met his obligations, that he was a kind of financial smuggler, who not only evaded the Customs duty but had not paid for his goods in the country of origin. The right hon. Gentleman had anticipated a surplus which ought to go to the reduction of debt in order to meet the ordinary expenditure of the year.

They all knew that the burden of taxation was enormous. He thought that the country hardly realised that the £25,000,000 of extra taxation put on for the war was still in existence for ordinary expenditure, and that the greater portion of that increased burden rested on the poor. The Chancellor of the Exchequer interrupted him when he was speaking about Mr. Gladstone's Budget of 1859 and stated that the tea duty in that year was very much higher than at the present time. But if the right hon. Gentleman had gone to the year 1866 he would have found that the tea duty was 2d. per lb. less than was proposed for the present year. They had, therefore, good reason to complain that this extra 2d. per lb. was imposed this year. It was a cruel tax, and next to the corn tax, it was the most oppressive that could be put on the poor. Moreover, when they increased the tea duty 4d. per lb., which was 100 per cent. on the value of the article, he maintained that it was inequitable taxation. It was a melancholy fact under the head of Customs, apart from Excise, which really bore most hardly on the poor, to find that the estimated revenue was £1,000,000 more than the estimate of 1902–3, which was the highest year of taxation during the war, and included the corn duty. The Chancellor of the Exchequer ought to give some explanation of the principles on which he had founded this extraordinary Budget. The Customs and Inland Revenue in 1902–3 amounted to £92,000,000, and the income-tax to £38,600,000, or a total of £130,600,000. The estimate of Customs and Inland Revenue for 1904–5 was £91,150,000, and of income-tax £30,000,000, or a total of £121,150,000. That was a reduction of the income-tax revenue of £8,600,000 compared with a reduction of less than £1,000,000 on the indirect taxes. Not only that, but there was no promise that there would be any reduction in the indirect taxation in the future. That was unfair to the indirect taxpayer. Moreover, what did the Chancellor of the Exchequer say in his Budget speech in regard to future policy as to income-tax? The right hon. Gentleman stated—

> "I say for myself, that, in my opinion, it is the income-tax payer who will have the first claim to relief."

The income-tax payer had already been relieved to the extent of 3d. per £, while there had been no reduction on the war taxes to the indirect taxpayer. All his war taxes were continued. He was perfectly certain that the country would have something to say in regard to this method of finance. The Chancellor of the Exchequer said that he was only faced with temporary difficulties. If that were so, his bold course would have been to put 2d. per £ on the income-tax to make up for the 1d. wrongfully remitted last year.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.) said that that was a very simple, but not a good course.

*MR. McCRAE said that the right hon. Gentleman would admit that on the question of income-tax he had the courage of his convictions, and had supported the Government. When the financial Nero was fiddling or dining he had come to his rescue. He asked, were the right hon. Gentleman's difficulties really only temporary?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The difficulties are partly temporary.

*MR. McCRAE said he accepted the correction; but the right hon. Gentleman had said—

> "I look for further relief to the cessation of military operations in Somaliland."

He spoke with bated breath, but he congratulated the Chancellor of the Exchequer on the fact that the cessation of military operations in Somaliland coincided with the introduction of the Budget. He was afraid, however, that the Chancellor of the Exchequer could not look for a reduction of expenditure in that direction, because so far as they could gather from the answers to Questions put in the House, the Somaliland question was again causing anxiety. Now, while it was not the duty of the Opposition to make specific proposals for the reduction of expenditure, he thought they were all agreed with the right hon. Gentleman in his Budget speech that they must look to Army reforms for a reduction in expenditure. The Estimates which the House passed in regard to the Army were bogus Estimates, Estimates for a scheme which had been declared to be defunct. If the Chancellor of the Exchequer secured a large reduction of expenditure on the Army, was the saving to be devoted to the promised relief of the income-tax payer? In the last year of the Liberal Government, 1894-5, the Army expenditure amounted to £17,700,000. This year it amounted to £29,400,000, or an increase of £11,700,000. The increase on the naval expenditure was £20,000,000. The greatest need of the present day was the need for financial reform. We must have a check on expenditure; we must have greater control. What was the real remedy for all this? It was very simple, very effective—a change of Government. The root of the evil lay in the policy of His Majesty's present advisers. What was wanted was to get back to the old paths of sound finance, and put in power the traditional guardians of the public purse who would exercise a wise and discriminating economy. The Secretary to the Treasury said—and he agreed with him—that expenditure depended on policy, and the hon. Member had asked what policy they, on that side of the House, had to offer? He would tell the hon. Member. It was a policy of peace. A peaceful policy was in the nature of things an economical policy. He was glad to see that there was soon to be an opportunity of getting a change of Government. They heard a voice last week from Birmingham, a high, if not the highest, authority in these matters, which said that a general election would take place in a reasonable time. They on that side of the House would welcome the opportunity of appealing to the constituencies of the country. They were waiting for that opportunity, and hoped that the Prime Minister would not be long in taking the plunge.

*MR. BECKETT (Yorkshire, N.R., Whitby) said he thought the House would agree that the Motion of the Leader of the Opposition was not superfluous. The question of national expenditure must appeal both to the House and to the country, though, judging from the aspect of the House just then, little practical interest seemed to be taken in it. He believed, however, that the economists were being daily recruited. He could assure hon. Gentlemen opposite that zeal for economy on the part of the Opposition was shared by Members on the Ministerial side of the House. The Secretary to the Treasury said he was rather tired of hearing professions of economy and that he would prefer to see them carried into practice. If he found himself walking into the Division Lobby against the hon. Gentleman on behalf of reductions in the Estimates, which made for economy, he trusted he would not be blamed by his Whips, but would plead the advice of the hon. Gentleman as sufficient justification. As a matter of fact, many Members had given positive proof that their professions were to be followed up by practice, because last year they moved that the Army should be reduced by 27,000 men. That was a practical measure in favour of economy, which might perfectly well have been carried out. It could hardly be contended that the present state of affairs was not a weakness and danger to this country which ought not to be allowed to continue. To wage a successful war you required three things, ships, men, and money. It was perfectly true that the public could bear this burden and a still greater burden. But if an animal had to go a long journey they must not load it up to its full carrying capacity. He trusted that this country would go a long journey, but that journey would be shortened if that carrying capacity was over-loaded, and it was over-loaded since we continued the war expenditure in peace time. He did not think it could be denied that the present expenditure was a war expenditure. It was true, as the Chancellor of the Exchequer pointed out, that it was only right and reasonable that our expenditure should increase with the increase of wealth and population, but the increase should be a proportionate increase. The increase during the last few years had been a totally disproportionate increase, and it was that disproportionate increase that was so alarming to all serious economists.

What had been the rate of increase in recent times? The last speaker had suggested a change of Government as the remedy for the present state of affairs. He was not quite so sure as to that when they considered the figures he proposed to bring before the House. They must compare the present time with a period when the state of affairs was pretty much as it existed to-day. A quarter of a century ago, at the end of Lord Beaconsfield's Administration, the expenditure of this country was £71,500,000. Lord Beaconsfield, it must be supposed, was fully alive to the Imperial necessities of the country; at any rate, he was denounced by hon. Gentleman who came into office on the cry of "Peace, Retrenchment, and Reform;" but during that tenure the expenditure increased to £81,000,000. Then the Conservative Party came into office, and in six years Lord Salisbury's Administration reduced the expenditure to £78,000,000. There were many hon. Gentlemen who pretended that a large expenditure was vital to the security of the nation. Did they mean to say that when Lord Salisbury reduced that expenditure he proved himself indifferent to national security? Did they pretend that Lord Salisbury starved and neglected the services, and was guilty of a cheese-paring Little Englandism? Yet, if there was anything in the contention that one was only a true patriot if one was spending money, Lord Salisbury himself fell into that category of Little Englandism. When Lord Salisbury went out the Party opposite came into power, and Sir William Harcourt, a most stern and rigid economist, became Chancellor of the

Exchequer. Again the expenditure rose from £78,000,000 to £81,000,000. This was what the Party of retrenchment did during their last tenure of office, and he therefore thought, without any discourtesy to the hon. Gentleman opposite he might somewhat question his statement that a change of Government would provide the right remedy for this policy of expenditure. In 1895 the present Government practically came into office; and in that year a remarkable thing happened. There was a coalition with the Liberal Unionists. Then the expenditure rose by leaps and bounds. In the first year it rose by £4,000,000, in the second year by £3,000,000, in the third year by £4,000,000, and in the fourth by £5,500,000. Then came the war. Before the war the increase of expenditure since the present Government came into office was at the extravagant rate of £3,500,000 a year, and if they reckoned what the expenditure should be during the present year at that rate—though he did not admit it was a fair rate—it ought to be £112,000,000 instead of £142,000,000. There was, therefore, an excess of £30,000,000 above what the rate of expenditure ought to be, even at the high rate of increase of £3,500,000.

During the last ten years the expenditure of the country had increased from £78,000,000 to £142,000,000, or £64,000,000. Was there anything that had happened during those ten years which could possibly justify that enormous increase? He thought he was justified in saying that they had a war expenditure in a time of peace, and everybody would agree that it was time to cry halt and to retrace their steps. Hon. Gentlemen might say perfectly truly, "you must prepare for war." But in continuing the present high rate of expenditure they were not preparing for war. As a matter of fact they were doing the very reverse. War was made by three things, viz., by ships, men, and money. There should be due order and proportion observed between the three. If they were spending too much on their men and ships, they were depleting their resources and weakening instead of strengthening themselves for war. It was just the same as if a prizefighter spent his time in developing his muscles and took too little food. He might be able to strike a hard blow, but could not fight to a finish. If we persisted in maintaining war expenditure in times of peace in order to prepare for war, we should have nothing to fall back upon when war did at last arise. They were more exhausted by the South African War than they thought they were, and the result was that they could not make war with a Great Power at the present moment. No Government would dare to involve this country in a great war at the present moment unless in defence of the national existence of the country. They had the men and the ships but they had not got the money, and until they had the money it was impossible for this country to go to war with a Great Power.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer made a great parade of the wealth of the country in his recent Budget speech, after having tried during the autumn to persuade the country that it was on the verge of ruin. The late Colonial Secretary said last week that England was a third-rate Power, and that if it did not follow his advice it would fall to a fifth-rate Power. That would be possible if the country continued to spend more money than it could afford. The point was that the limits of the taxable capacity of the country had now been pretty well reached. Customs and Excise were no longer buoyant, and if expenditure were to be increased more would have to be put on tea, tobacco, beer, and spirits. Without raising a controversial question, he might add that the Licensing Bill would deprive the country of a potential source of revenue. Commodities were now taxed as highly as they could bear, and if they were taxed more the result would be to diminish consumption. In imposing taxation what ought to be borne in mind was that they should fix duties at such rates as would produce increased consumption, because that implied increased trade, that more capital was put into ships, that more sailors were employed, more goods were imported, and in order to manufacture those goods more raw material had to be imported, and more ships would have to be built for that purpose, and also to take the manufactured goods to other countries. That meant that they would make more machinery, would employ more men, and would generally enjoy greater prosperity as a result of increased consumption. Considering that they were in a time of peace, he was justified in saying that the taxable capacity of the country in respect of duties had been exploited to the utmost extent that was advisable in times of peace. There only remained the income-tax, which was already high enough. If money had to be raised for war purposes it was well known that the second shilling would not produce anything like as much as the first shilling had produced. Hon. Gentlemen opposite were in favour of a graduated income-tax, but, speaking as a banker, he thought the difficulty of graduation was insuperable. It would lead to falsehood and evasion and should not be imposed, especially as the death duties were graduated. They were a fruitful source of revenue, and at the same time a fruitful source of hardship. The point now was that the Government could not continue to raise revenue from a reluctant people. The people were not paying cheerfuly, and a wise Government would lighten the burden in times of depression even though it involved the delay of the shipbuilding programme, especially when there was no immediate cause for anxiety.

He thought the Government had given practical proof that they now favoured a policy of peace. That treaty having been ratified, and the danger of war with France averted, he hoped for ever, was surely a time when we could afford to economise even in our Fleet. Our Fleet was now fully up to the two-Power standard which was sufficient for all purposes. With regard to the Army nothing more need be said. Everybody agreed that the Army expenditure could be decreased, and he and those who thought with him were of opinion that without impairing the efficiency of the Army the expenditure could be reduced by £5,000,000 or £10,000,000 a year. Nature had placed us in such a position that we did not need a large Army, and by our excessive expenditure we were throwing away that defence which nature had given us. We spent on armaments £1 10s. per head of the population; in France, it was £1 1s. 2d.; in Germany, 15s. 6d.; in Russia, 6s. 11d.: in Austria, 7s. 10d.; and in Italy, 9s. 11d. Was there anything that could justify us in spending on armaments at a greater rate than our neighbours. This competition of expenditure with neighbouring nations, in which we had left them far behind, was bound to be most disastrous to this country. The price to which Consols had fallen showed that to some extent the credit of the country was impaired, and if we went to war now, and had to borrow £200,000,000, we should have to pay very different terms to those on which we had secured money hitherto. He was not satisfied with the position of the Sinking Fund. The House had been led to suppose that £7,000,000 a year would be paid in reduction of debt, but that was not the case; only £3,800,000 had been paid. Not so long ago when the income-tax stood at 6d., £6,000,000 a year was being paid in reduction of debt. Now when it stood at 1s. only £3,800,000 was paid in reduction, and our debt was £200,000,000 higher. That was a state of things that ought not to be allowed to continue. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had been very severe on municipalities, but had not a word of rebuke for national extravagance, but he would venture to point out that, so far as municipalities were concerned, £121,000,000 of their expenditure was reproductive and produced an income after paying the interest on the debt and a certain sum in reduction of the principal, and setting aside a sum for depreciation of £400,000 a year. If the national expenditure was reproductive in the same way, something might have been said for it. He deprecated this expenditure. The best preparation for war, in his opinion, was a moderate expenditure in time of peace.

Sir BRAMPTON GURDON (Norfolk, N.) said he was glad to have heard the speech just delivered, because, though the Resolution might not be carried, it showed that there were those in the House who were desirous of decreasing the present great expenditure. In the early years of the reign of Queen Victoria, the country was almost forced into economy. The country then had a very heavy debt to bear, and for the first five years of that reign there was a continued deficit of about £1,500,000 to make good. Sir Robert Peel was the first to stem the tide of expenditure, and he established a rigid system of economy which was afterwards carried out by Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Disraeli. At that time expenditure and income averaged £50,000,000 a year, and that average was continued during the whole of Sir Robert Peel's Administration and through that of Lord John Russell. Then came the Crimean War. During the first year of that war the national expenditure jumped up £30,000,000, in the second year £50,000,000, and in the third year £34,000,000, because directly the declaration of peace took place £17,500,000 were knocked off the Estimates. That war had the effect of promoting in this country a spirit of militarism, and naval and military expenditure had never got down to ante-Crimean days. Much had been said about the state of unpreparedness in which the country was at the time of the Crimean War. The Navy was less powerful than now, and we had a small Army. On the other side we had France as an ally and Russia as an enemy, but the fact remained that our enemy was so exhausted and our ally so weakened in finance that they accepted terms while we could have gone on for five years more. Our success did not depend so much on our armaments as on our credit. Our naval and military expenditure when Queen Victoria came to the throne was £12,000,000; in fifty years it increased by 150 per cent. and at the second Jubilee it had increased to £42,000,000. The history of the past five years was most alarming, for in that period our naval and military expenditure had increased to £72,000,000. In twelve years the income raised by taxation had increased from £75,000,000 to £121,000,000, although the population had grown only from 38,000,000 to 42,000,000. There had been added £13,000,000 to the income-tax, £6,000,000 to the death duties, £4,000,000 to the tea duty, £4,000,000 to the liquor duties, and £2,000,000 to the tobacco duty; £6,000,000 had been drawn from the sugar duty, and £2,000,000 from an export duty on coal. It was a question whether the country could bear any more. Most people had been obliged to recast their style of living and to retrench in every possible way. Personally, he had never felt the pressure of taxation until now, he could not bear any more; and if, whether by taxes or by rates, any more was to be compulsorily taken out of his pocket it could only come back to him in the form of Poor Law relief.

Much had been said about "broadening the basis of taxation." To his mind society was designed like a pyramid. At the base was the labouring class, then came the artisans and mechanics; then shopkeepers and merchants; and finally the millionaires at the summit. Hence when Ministers spoke about broadening the basis of taxation, it simply meant putting a heavier burden of taxation on the base of the pyramid, viz., the working classes, by whom four-fifths of the taxation on articles of consumption was paid. He was glad to think that economical ideas were reviving. It seemed as though the public were being taxed into economy. The Motion to which reference had been made, for a reduction of the Army by 27,000 men was the first real Motion in that direction for many years. The House of Commons had tried to deceive itself about the expenditure. Estimates had been reduced by a system of appropriations in aid; they had been further relieved by the allocation of taxes to local bodies; and a system of Loans Acts had served to keep expenditure out of the Budget. The truth, however, could not be concealed. He fully sympathised with a remark made by the Financial Secretary about the Civil Service Estimates. He strongly protested against the idea that Civil servants should be paid liberally. They ought to be paid justly, and there was no reason why the Civil servant should get more than his master, the taxpayer; he ought to be paid at the market rate, and no more. The division taken on Friday last was hardly a fair illustration of the extravagance of the House, because the Bill then under consideration was not for increased expenditure; it was merely a question of whether taxes already levied, though not by the Government, for the upkeep of lighthouses fell on the right shoulders. The increase in the

Civil Service, however, had the advantage that it did not lead to more expenditure, as was the case with increases in military and naval Estimates. On that point he would recommend the House to read a recent article by Lord Cromer on "Imperialism." It was unnecessary to discuss Army expenditure, as there was a general feeling that we could have a smaller and more efficient Army for less money than we were now paying.

In regard to the Navy, it was fashionable to say that the country would grudge no expenditure, but it should be borne in mind that this year we were spending £11,500,000 upon new ships and machinery, without arms, which was more than we used to spend upon the whole Navy. In the last year of Lord Goschen's tenure of office, France and Germany were building, but £8,000,000 were considered to be amply sufficient. In 1901, Germany, France, and Russia together spent £33,415,000 upon their navies: we alone spent £33,791,000, or more than these three Powers together. Since 1901, France, Germany, and Russia had added only £1,500,000 to their combined naval expenditure, while we had added £10,000,000. On the Admiralty's own calculation, that armour-plated ships became obsolete in twenty-two years, cruisers in fifteen years, and torpedo and small boats in twelve years, an annual expenditure of £4,500,000 would be sufficient to replace the ships which became obsolete, while the present rate of £11,500,000 was sufficient to double the number of war vessels in ten years. An increase in the size of the Fleet would require larger establishment, more dock space, and more basins. Since 1883, we had launched forty-one new ships, or exactly the same number as France, Germany, and Russia together, but whereas their tonnage was 455,000, ours was 550,000. Therefore, instead of keeping to the two-Power standard, we were going beyond a three-Power standard, and that at a time when we were on better terms with France than ever before in the annals of history, when the war in the East had crippled Russia, and when there was a growing opposition to expenditure in Germany. Much, too, might be said about the burden imposed upon the people of the United Kingdom for armaments which were necessary for the defence not only of these islands, but also of the Colonies. We were a loyal people, and had borne the war taxes with patience; whatever grumbling there had been had come mainly from those whose services to the country had consisted in shouting with the band; and he hoped the Government, knowing how patiently the country had borne its burden, would not in time of peace try their loyalty too severely.

SIR GEORGE BARTLEY (Islington, N.) said that, although he had been a Member of the House for a considerable number of years, he had never before known a "count" to be moved in the course of the debate on the Budget Bill, especially when a virtual vote of censure upon the Government in regard to expenditure had been moved. That it should have been possible seemed to prove the hollowness of much of the cry for economy. That the debate was hardly a serious one was shown by a comparison of the state of the House to-day and a few nights ago when the question of salaries to Members of Parliament was under discussion. He had always felt that the question of economy ought to be considered by the House of Commons to a far greater extent than was at present the case, and one of the reasons he had strongly urged the maintenance of the Sinking Fund was that it was an indirect way of insisting on economy. National expenditure had grown in a remarkable and unsatisfactory manner. He did not intend to discuss naval and military expenditure. He might say, however, with regard to the Navy, that he believed it was essential that the Fleet should be above suspicion in efficiency, quality, and quantity, as it was the main defence of the Empire; but there was a growing hope in the country that, in view of the recent treaty with France, and events in the East, it might be possible before long to effect a large reduction in the Navy, and certainly in the Army.

It should not be forgotten that a large portion of the increase of expenditure was on the Civil Service Estimates, and it was to that that he desired to direct his remarks. It was useless for Members to say that too much money was being spent unless they were prepared to point to items which they considered ought to be reduced. He had studied these Estimates for many years, and he found that in fifteen years they had practically doubled. That was a very large increase in the expenditure, and those who talked so much about our expenditure being excessive were bound to go into these details. In going into these details he wished to refer to the various items of this great increase in the expenditure. He would first take Class I., which was the expenditure for buildings. He would give the gross increase in the twelve years from 1893 to 1904, which extended over the special period they were discussing and which included what had been called the misdoings of the present Government. For this period the increase in Class I. amounted to very nearly £1,000,000, and this was enough for hon. Members opposite to talk about the enormous extravagance of the Government. That argument might go down all right at a public meeting where nobody knew any better, but he wished the House to look into the figures in order to see how that £1,000,000 was made up. A quarter of that increase was due to the rating of Government property, and surely the Government could not be blamed for that. Then there was an increase of £150,000 for post office and telegraph buildings. Could any hon. Member put his finger on that item and say it was extravagant? Such expenditure showed the development of business and increased prosperity. Then there was an item for extra land and insurance £75,000, and fuel £50,000. There was also an increase in the wages of Government employees, which was continually being urged upon the Government by hon. Gentlemen opposite. The other day a proposal was made that everybody employed by the Government should receive a minimum wage of 30s. a week. For the last ten, twelve, or fourteen years they had been continually increasing wages—he did not say wrongly—but after they had done this, was it fair to turn round upon the Government when all this had been done by the order of the House, and say that it was due to their extravagance. The various items he had mentioned made up nearly the £1,000,000 increase in Class I. of the Estimates.

He would now turn to Class II., which included the salaries and expenses of the various Government Departments. This Vote had increased by £870,000 a year during the twelve years he was considering. The amounts for the House of Lords and the House of Commons were less, the amount for the Treasury was the same, but the sums taken by the Foreign Office, the Privy Council, and the Charity Commissioners were also less, and a great number of the smaller offices spent smaller sums. He would show the House, however, where the great increases came in. In the Home Office there had been an increase during the period he was considering of £62,000; in the Board of Trade Department there had been an increase of £40,000; whilst the Board of Agriculture, which had been created owing to the demand of the public, was responsible for the expenditure of another £60,000. All those Government Departments really represented expenditure upon a matter of policy which had been forced upon the Government by the various interests in the country, representing all shades of opinion on both sides of the House, and therefore it was absurd to turn round and charge the Government with extravagance, because the policy of the country demanded an enormous increase in the various inspections and inspectors, and in the various Departments of the State, in order to make the State better and more competent to carry on the work of government, to make the various Departments more efficient, and to see that the working people had healthier and more sanitary surroundings. When they found that all these matters cost something like £1,500,000 was it not childish and absurd for them to turn round and condemn the Government that had carried out this policy, for extravagant expenditure. It was the policy of the country that had dictated this expenditure. As one who had always been keenly interested in the welfare of the people—although he thought sometimes this expenditure had been rather overdone—still, whether they approved of it or not the money had all been spent with the idea of improving the habits, conditions, and happiness of the people of this country. He was glad that they had expended this money, and it was neither right nor reasonable that hon. Gentlemen opposite should turn upon the Government and charge them with extragavance because they had increased the expenditure in that direction. He noticed that during the twelve years under consideration there had been an increase of £117,000 for stationery and printing. He thought this was very excessive, and might be reduced, because it was largely due to the printing demanded by hon. Members of the House which had led to a very large increase in this Vote. With regard to printing and stationery they were luxurious in their habits and they demanded it, and therefore this was another instance where it was unreasonable to charge the Government with extravagance. In Class II. there had been an enormous increase in the wages, and that again was an expenditure for which the Government could not be held responsible.

The law expenses were practically the same as they were thirteen years ago, but when they turned to Class IV., which was for Education, what did they find? Why, that during the twelve years he had taken the Vote for education had increased from £9,000,000 to nearly £16,000,000, or, in other words, the Vote had increased by nearly £7,000,000. He did nor think that even hon. Gentlemen opposite were disposed to reduce the amount which was now being spent upon the education of the people. The regular cry all over the country was to increase the expenditure upon this Vote. He remembered when he first entered the Education Department more than forty years ago, the Education Vote was keenly criticised because it showed an increase of £2,000 or £3,000, but now every year this Vote increased not by thousands or by tens of thousands, but by hundreds of thousands. He hoped they were getting all the advantage which had been predicted out of this expenditure, but it was childish to abuse the Government because during their term of office an increase of £7,000,000 had taken place in the Education Vote, when hon. Members opposite knew that on every platform they were always telling the people that this was one of the best forms of expenditure they had, and that it was necessary in order to enable them to compete with the foreigner. The items he had mentioned accounted for a very large increase in the expenditure. Class V., for foreign and colonial services, also showed an increase of nearly £1,500,000, and this included the expenditure upon Uganda, colonial services, and Northern Nigeria. This expenditure might be either right or wrong, but at any rate it accounted for a part of the increase. The sixth item showed a satisfactory indication of economy, and it dealt with the Pension Vote, which was actually less now than it was twelve or thirteen years ago. It looked as though they were not quite so liberal in regard to pensions as they used to be when they took into consideration the increases which had taken place in the staff. Class VII. was for commissions in the Navy, which showed an increase of £150,000. There was an item of £70,000 for the St. Louis Exhibition, which again was a matter of policy, although he did not think it would do much good. At any rate it pleased America and helped the nations to work harmoniously together, and it would be a pity if this country, for the sake of saving this amount of money, had not been a party to that great Exhibition which would be an advantage to unity, peace, prosperity, and commerce. Then the Irish Development Grant had taken £185,000, so that if these items were taken out of this Vote there was actually a reduction in the total expenditure.

He was afraid that he had wearied the House with these various details, but it seemed to him that it was really necessary and desirable, in discussing a question like this, for all these items, which might appear very insignificant, became very important in regard to the increase in the expenditure. The Secretary to the Treasury had referred to the decision of the House in regard to the Merchant Shipping (Lighthouses) Bill. The other night a proposal was made for the payment of Members, which would have involved something like £350,000 a year, and it was also suggested that the profits derived from the Post Office should be given up and that the rich shipowners should be relieved of the charges made for light dues at the expense of the State. He did not think that the shipowners were a class of men who were in such desperate pecuniary difficulties that they should burden the taxpayers with an additional half a million of money. Those things showed the absurdity of talking about economy in this House, and he regretted very much that the debates in this House had practically no tendency towards economy. He did not think for a moment that the country was in such a bad way that it could not bear the taxation which was now imposed upon it. He believed that even at the present time they were taxed less heavily than most European countries, and they were a great deal better off than a great many of those foreign countries. There were an immense number of people who were in great poverty, and who had great difficulty to live. They found taxation extremely hard, and this House was bound to consider their position.

The hon. Member for North Norfolk had referred to the cost of the Army and Navy now as compared with what it was at the time Her late Majesty came to the throne. He thought those comparisons were perfectly useless. Guns and everything in connection with these services were different, and the cost now was very much more. The nation had developed enormously in wealth, and if they considered the increase in prosperity and population, the increase in expenditure was not so remarkable as it might otherwise appear. He thought, however, there were many small ways in which they might economise. He was quite certain that during the last twenty years most of the extravagance of which they complained had been due to the action of the House of Commons itself. In theory every hon. Gentleman, on both sides of the House, advocated economy; but every hon. Gentleman had a particular fad of his own which meant extravagance. The result was that every individual was always pressing for something which he thought most important and which was increasing the expenditure of the country, though when he came here and spoke in the abstract he wished to reduce expenditure. The Government had no doubt many faults to correct. No doubt that went without saying of any Government. They had done many things they ought not to have done, and had left undone many things they ought to have done. He had never seen or heard of any Government that had not. In regard to extravagance, he thought that could not be laid on the shoulders of the Government. The expenditure was what this House desired. They were delighted that the Navy had been strengthened, but they were like the man who had enjoyed a good dinner when he came to pay the bill. They did not like it so well. In regard to the Army, they knew perfectly well the expenditure had been somewhat extravagant in connection with the war in South Africa. When they were in difficulty in the dark hours at the end of 1899 they were very glad to find that though there had been large expenditure they had been able to send out men. The cost of the Civil Service had enormously increased, and that was due very much to the action of this House. If they wished to reduce that expenditure they must carefully consider every item, but as long as they were determined to increase the expenditure on education and various other matters—he should be sorry to advocate reductions in certain directions—they could not expect for some time to come to reduce these items of expenditure.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee) said that a great deal had been said about the Navy, and it was because of an allusion made by the Secretary to the Treasury that he desired to say a few words about the Navy Estimates. The hon. Gentleman was most unfair to the Opposition. He taunted them with the small portion of time devoted to these Estimates. What had happened this session? More time had been devoted to the Navy than in any session he could remember, and the reason undoubtedly was that the Admiralty was, as usual, better prepared than any other Department. The Votes allowed to pass with little or no discussion were comparatively unimportant—for non-effective services and other matters in which no serious reduction could be thought of. What was important was the Vote which was postponed, and of which hon. Gentlemen talked as if it were of no importance. The Vote postponed was Section 3 of the Navy Estimates, Vote 8, which included the Vote for new construction, upon which the whole growth of the

Navy Estimates depended. They arranged for its being postponed because it was unfair to take it in a small House, and because it was the desire of both sides that for once, at all events, the policy of the Government respecting new construction should be seriously considered. He hoped his hon. friends who had been joining in the appeal for economy would remember that the new construction Vote had been kept back for further discussion, and if they meant anything by their professions of economy they would for the first time face the responsibility of saying whether or not they would assent to this unparalleled demand for £11,500,000 for new ships, which would result in the £38,000,000 to be spent on the Navy this year becoming £50,000,000 or £60,000,000 in a very short time hence. He regarded the declaration in his right hon. friend's Amendment as at this stage merely a pious opinion, which must be translated into action on the Estimates, and particularly on the Vote to which he had referred.

There was no doubt that Supplementary Estimates upset the financial equilibrium of the year, and as Mr. Gladstone used to say withdrew from the House of Commons a portion of its power of controlling expenditure. This year the Supplementary Estimates had two particular general features. There was a power which the Government of the day had of spending public money for purposes not authorised by Parliament at all. When he asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer the other day about the Chilian battleships he appeared to resent the question, and his friends appeared to think that it was another imputation upon his honour. In the course of the recess the right hon. Gentleman made himself responsible for the application of public money—he was not calling it in question—for a purpose which Parliament had never sanctioned, and when he put it to him the right hon. Gentleman did not admit it, but he tried to excuse it.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I did admit it.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON said what he was complaining of was that he did not get from the right hon. Gentleman the frank acknowledgment he wanted for the information of the House. Did the House know by what means this expenditure was possible? Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman would tell him how he got hold of the money. They had been accustomed to believe that no money could be taken out of the Consolidated Fund for a purpose not sanctioned by Parliament, and that the Comptroller-General was the officer accredited for the purpose of preventing any such expenditure taking place. Now it appeared that that was all wrong, and that public money might be applied subject to an Act of indemnity passed by the House. That was a very serious state of things. He supposed that the money for these Chilian battleships was obtained by using a credit given by the Comptroller-General to carry out the Supply voted in the previous year. But the money having been placed at the disposal of the Treasury was illegally used for a purpose which Parliament had not sanctioned. That was an extraordinary kind of financial control, and he thought the House would agree that it did not make for the supervision of the House over expenditure or for economy in administration. Supplementary Estimates were bad always, but this year they were used deliberately to create a deficit. Practically the whole deficit of the year was the result of these Supplementary Estimates. His complaint was that it did not make it possible for them to know, when that deficit was being created or how the Chancellor of the Exchequer was going to meet it. If they had known that the whole of the deficit was to be met out of capital, not a man in the House would have passed it. It was a great blot on the Budget that a deficit so created should have been paid for out of capital in time of peace. It was unworthy of a British Chancellor of the Exchequer. Yet the Chancellor of the Exchequer had plumed himself on the fact. The real truth was that the deficit of last year was £5,500,000, for which the Chancellor of the Exchequer provided by the £3,000,000 from the Transvaal and £1,000,000 of unclaimed dividends. That was as if he had sold £1,000,000 of the Suez Canal shares. The Transvaal money had been not only borrowed, but twice borrowed. Three millions more than were wanted were borrowed for the war, and we lent that money to the Transvaal Government. It was repaid out of the money borrowed by them and guaranteed by this country.

Another blot on the Budget was that it increased the taxation levied on the very poorest of the poor who had less than the absolute necessaries of life. There was a margin of the population, numbering many millions, who had so little to live on that they should not be taxed at all. All taxation of that class, which was always indirect—if they knew they were being taxed there would be a revolution in this country—was an irremediable wrong. He did not think there was any legitimate necessity for relieving co-ordinately direct and indirect taxation. All increase of indirect taxation in the way proposed by the Budget was not only doubly wrong, but became a crime when they knew that the Chancellor of the Exchequer did not scruple to add to the burdens of those who ought not to bear taxation at all, and especially when he deliberately ignored publicans' licences, from which some of his hon. friends estimated that a revenue of £8,750,000 could be obtained. The right hon. Gentleman had refused to the House an inquiry as to the monopoly value of these licences, and in another Bill the attempt was going to be made to give that monopoly value to the publicans.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member is going beyond the questions involved in the Finance Bill.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON said he was not going to discuss that point further, but, restricted as he was, he would advise his hon. friends beside him not to be unduly downcast by the result of the vote on the Licensing Bill. He would invite them to believe that the proper place for them to fight that Bill——

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member is engaged in discussing the Licensing Bill.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I am very sorry that I have attempted to say what I meant to say.

AN HON. MEMBER: "Lead us not into temptation."

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: What he wanted to discuss was the value of the monopoly given by the State to the publicans by their licences. The claim he made was that these licences were a proper subject of taxation and that they were a national asset, that that asset ought to be realised before any increase was made on the already heavy burden of taxation on the poorest of the poor. That was a point which, he submitted, might be made on the present Budget Bill, and it would certainly be enforced by Amendments in Committee. The House of Lords could control certain kinds of legislation; but they could not refuse to assent to a Money Bills, and it would be perfectly open to a future House of Commons to declare that these licence duties were still too low, that the value of them was still public property, and that it was the duty of the State to appropriate that value.

MR. H. C. RICHARDS (Finsbury, E.) said that if he were in order, arguments could be addressed which would completely demolish the case which had been attempted to be set up by the hon. and learned Member for Dundee. But that would be reserved for another occasion. How could it be successfully contended that the expenditure on the Chilian war ships was illegal when the Chancellor of the Exchequer, as soon as possible, informed the House of their purchase, and asked the permission of Parliament to sanction it? He would call the attention of the House to the fact that the money for the purchase of the Suez Canal shares was obtained by Mr. Disraeli when the House of Commons was not sitting. The question of legality or illegality was a question whether the House of Commons would give approval for what had been done. He remembered the late Lord Chief Justice Coleridge stating that it was absolutely impossible to contend that the House of Commons had acted illegally in such circumstances; because if they had sanctioned anything afterwards they had made it legal by their subsequent action. That was expressed in the Prayer-book when it spoke of this being the High Court of Parliament. So long as the Chancellor of the Exchequer came to this House, at the earliest possible opportunity, and disclosed what he had done, it was absurd for the hon. and learned Member for Dundee to make his appeal to the House of Commons and to threaten the Chancellor of the Exchequer with having been guilty of some high crime and misdemeanour which would in olden times have led him to the scaffold. The hon. Gentleman had said something about there being only pious opinions on the other side of the House; but one of the greatest difficulties of hon. Gentlemen opposite would be, when they transferred themselves to the Government side of the House, to justify the promises they had made. It would be the old, old story. He must confess that it might be his want of financial experience, but he could not follow the hon. Gentleman in regard to the missing doubly borrowed money from the Transvaal. It showed the necessity not only of auditors for municipal, but for Government, accounts.

He agreed with the hon. Gentleman who referred to the growing items of municipal expenditure, but he did not accept the hon. Gentleman's figures, or his statement that a large part of that expenditure was reproductive. The majority of municipalities had no independent audit, and until they had an independent audit he could not accept figures as to what should be put to capital and what to revenue. He could not follow the argument of the right hon. Gentleman who attacked the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and who said that the first object of the Supplementary Estimates was to create a deficit at the moment when the Chancellor of the Exchequer was preparing his first Budget. The country did not look forward with pleasure to a deficit; and he never yet heard that it was any part of the policy of a new Chancellor of the Exchequer to create a bogus deficit unless he had the deliberate desire to make himself, and the Government of which he was a member, unpopular. The hon. Member for Whitby gave the House two figures which should be well studied in connection with expenditure on the Army and Navy. Did the hon. Gentleman imagine that this country would be satisfied with the miserable pittance paid to soldiers and sailors in France and Germany, that this country would have conscription and insult its soldiers and sailors with two or three sous per day. He could not imagine what was the object of the comparison of the hon. Gentleman, except to damage his own Party. He knew something of the misery which was endured by the common soldier in Germany, and knew that he was unable to keep body and soul together unless he received a weekly remittance from his parents. If this country were to pay its soldiers a living wage, and have intelligent men in the ranks of the Army, they could not reduce the amount *per capita* now paid. He had some sympathy, however, with the suggested reduction in the number of troops. The first vote he ever gave against his Party was given against the Army Corps scheme, because he was convinced that if the War Office would make more use of the Volunteers and the Reserves it would not be necessary to have such a large standing Army. He had seen such a desire on the part of the middle classes to serve in the Auxiliary Forces, that he was convinced that if more attention was paid to that branch it would not be necessary to keep up the Regular Army at anything like its present strength. He hoped that the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in consultation with the War Office, would make it clear that while the nation wished its soldiers to be properly trained and paid, the enrolment of civilian soldiers should also be encouraged. He was very much struck, in travelling through India two years ago, with the magnificent physique and splendid position of the native forces, who might be relied upon more and more to defend the extremities of the Empire. The hon. Gentleman who referred to the French and German military system was speaking only to the Press Gallery, and he must have known perfectly well that it was impossible to adopt any such system in this country.

The hon. Gentleman for one of the Divisions in Norfolk referred to the period when Mr. Ayrton was Chancellor of the Exchequer but was there ever a more economical or a more unpopular person? No less a person than the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouth, who had great experience in this House, said that economy in itself was not popular; and all who knew anything of the working classes knew that they did not approve of anything approaching a policy of cheese-paring in connection with the Army and the Navy. Unquestionably, the burden of taxation was now breaking the back of the middle classes. In his own constituency he saw the small shopkeeper being driven out by the large companies. That was caused not only by competition but also by the great burden of the rates. It was no use for hon. Gentlemen opposite to contend that municipal taxation did not fall heavily on the working classes; and he was not at all surprised that in some districts the rents had been reduced, the tenants being required to pay the local rates, not the landlords. That brought home to the tenant what the burden of the local rates was.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Gentleman is now discussing a wider question than that before the House.

Mr. H. C. RICHARDS said the only other point to which he would refer was the great and growing expenditure which had now fallen on the Civil Service Estimates, and he thought that that was a matter which demanded attention.

And, it being half-past Seven of the clock, the debate stood adjourned until this Evening's Sitting.

EVENING SITTING.

GOSPORT WATER BILL [LORDS] (BY ORDER).

A verbal Amendment made; Bill read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

FINANCE BILL.

[Second Reading.]

Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on Amendment to Question [16th May], "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Which Amendment was—

"To leave out from the word 'That,' to the end of the Question, in order to add the words 'this House, having regard to the heavy burden of taxation proposed by this Bill in a time of peace, deems it necessary to declare its condemnation of the large and continuous increase of the national expenditure in recent years.'"—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

*Mr. JOSEPH WALTON (Yorkshire, W.R., Barnsley) said there was no question which could occupy the attention of the House to greater advantage, having regard to the alarming increase of our normal national expenditure, than the question of the retrenchment of that expenditure. The hon. Member for Whitby had informed the House that there had been an increase of £64,500,000 in the normal expenditure of this country in the last ten years, and when we remembered that that expenditure was largely unproductive it must appeal to us that so large an unproductive expenditure derived from the taxation of the whole community must so lessen the purchasing power of the community in regard to everything needed to feed and clothe them, and furnish their homes, as to exercise a detrimental influence on the general commercial prosperity of the whole nation. They were told that the expenditure for Imperial defence for 1904–5, including military and naval works and Supplementary Estimates, amounted to the gigantic sum of no less than £88,000,000, in 1891 the total expenditure was only £33,000,000. Such an alarming increase ought to cause the House to give the closest attention to the question of expenditure for Imperial defence. The Secretary to the Treasury had told the House that hon. Members had neglected their opportunities of criticising increased expenditure in connection with the Estimates, and that was perfectly true. Each Estimate ought to be criticised as it was presented to the House, but, on the other hand, it was the duty of the Government and especially of the Chancellor of the Exchequer to justify to the House and the country the enormous increase that had taken place in the national expenditure in time of peace. The expenditure last year, in time of peace, was £9,000,000 in excess of the previous year, and when the result of the financial year came to be known, it was found that not only had the expenditure been underestimated by £3,000,000 but the revenue had been overestimated by £2,750,000. The £3,000,000 added to the £9,000,000 increase of the previous year made a total of £12,000,000, which had only been reduced by £1,500,000 for next year. So that for next year the Estimates of expenditure amounted to £10,500,000 more than they did two years ago. It was not so much for the Liberal side of the House to show where this expenditure should be curtailed, as it rested upon the Government to justify this enormous increase in a time of peace.

At an earlier stage of the Budget Resolutions he had raised the point as to how much we were to allow the knowledge and experience gained from the war at present being waged in the Far East to be left out of consideration. In that war it had been demonstrated that it was unwise to build huge battleships costing millions of money, which by a well-laid mine or torpedo could be sent to the bottom of the sea in five minutes. In view of the knowledge gained by that war, so far as it had gone, the Government might with great advantage direct their attention to the question of whether a larger number of smaller and heavily armed and gunned ships might not be built at considerably less cost and be more effective for Imperial defence. A great deal had been said in the House on the question of Army expenditure. With regard to that the ex-Chancellor of the Exchequer had said—

> "If the War Office laid out the money it got to the best possible advantage, which nobody outside the War Office believes it does, the strength of the Army could be reduced with advantage, and yet we might have a better Army."

It was not the idea of Liberal Members to reduce the pay of Tommy Atkins, but they believed a small Army better trained and equipped would be more effective than that which existed. It had been condemned as to its organisation root and branch by a Commission appointed by the Government. He repudiated the suggestion that they wanted to give the soldier less or to mete out less liberal treatment and encouragement to the promotion of the efficiency of the Militia, Volunteers, and Imperial Yeomanry, upon which the country must mainly depend in time of war for home defence.

He objected to the inflated national expenditure, because the Government had utterly failed to show any justification for it, in addition to which the taxation was unfair. Would the Chancellor of the Exchequer say if it were right in 1903, when remitting taxation to the extent of £10,500,000, to remit direct taxation in the proportion of four-fifths, and indirect taxation to the extent of one-fifth. Should not the same proportions be observed when it became necessary this year to reimpose a portion of the taxation taken off in 1903.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said he had answered the question in anticipation in his Budget speech.

*MR. JOSEPH WALTON pointed out that in the taxation imposed this year the proportions were half-and-half. He further asked whether, in view of the enormous national expenditure, the right hon. Gentleman had given attention to the possibility of getting increased grants towards Imperial defence from the great self-governing Colonies of the Empire.

MR. SPEAKER: That is a separate question which does not arise on this Bill.

*MR. JOSEPH WALTON bowed to the ruling of the Chair, and continuing, said the additional taxation imposed ought to have been avoided by cutting down both the Army and Navy Vote so as to prevent especially the further imposition of 2d. on tea. In 1900, when 2d. was put on tea, the right hon. Gentleman the then Chancellor of the Exchequer said that this extra 2d. was an exceptional tax levied for the purpose of the war. Two years later when he had to impose further taxation he said, bearing in mind that tea which was almost a necessity of life was already taxed up to 75 per cent. of its annual value, he should be sorry to increas it and he did not do so; but last year when the right hon. Gentleman had £10,500,000 taxation to remit, surely that 2d. on tea, which was a war tax, ought to have been taken off, instead of which the

Chancellor of the Exchequer this year imposed an additional 2d. on tea. There was no justification in this Budget of such an unfair burden being placed on the working classes of the country.

While they deplored the enormous increase in the expenditure for the defensive forces, they rejoiced in the increase of the expenditure for education. When in Massachusetts last autumn, he found that no less than £1 per head of the population there was spent on education, whereas in this country we only spent 8s. per head. In this connection he was reminded of an incident, connected with the educational expenditure, that happened in a Scottish constituency. A candidate was being heckled by a constituent who asked—"Am I to understand, Mr. Wason, that while you are prepared to spend £31,000,000 sterling on the Army and Navy you are only prepared to spend £8,000,000 on education; that while you are prepared to spend £31,000,000 in 'blawing brains oot' you are only prepared to spend £8,000,000 in 'pitting brains in'?" That question applied with greater force to-day when we were spending £16,000,000 "pitting brains in" and £88,000,000 in "blawing brains oot," or preparing to do so. A great majority on both sides of the House would welcome increased expenditure which would enable us to hold our own in competing commercially with the more highly educated, scientifically, nations of Europe.

There was one especial item which he had hoped to see dealt with this year in the annual Budget. He had hoped that by the practice of the most rigid economy the Government would have placed themselves in the position of being able to remove the tax upon coal, a tax from which the Treasury derived a revenue of £2,000,000; but a tax which was flagrantly unjust. Those engaged in the coal trade contributed in every respect the same as every other great industry of the country, in addition to which, owing to the mode of assessing, they were paying more heavily in regard to income-tax than perhaps any other great industry in the country. He hoped this point would be brought under the consideration of the Departmental Committee which the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer had recently appointed to consider the question of the income-tax. Coal-owners had to return their profits on the basis of the preceding five years, whilst iron and steel works and other industries based their returns on the preceding year only. It was, therefore, obvious that if the coal-owners had to take the basis of five years they had to include the prosperous year of 1900 in their average, and were thus paying more than they should do to fulfil the intentions of the income-tax. The result was they paid a large amount of income-tax out of capital. The case for the removal of this coal tax was a very just one. It was true that the exports of coal last year had somewhat increased largely owing to the strike in America creating a demand for more than 1,000,000 tons, but that did not alter the fact except in regard to Welsh steam coal. The firms in Durham, Northumberland, Yorkshire, and Scotland who exported coal, came into competition with Germany, France, and Belgium, and, by reason of this tax of 1s. a ton, were receiving at the pit's mouth 1s. a ton less than they otherwise would. The result of the trading of the first eight weeks of this year at one colliery in Northumberland, had been a loss of £1,700, and but for the tax that trading would have resulted in a profit of £1,800. In his division in Yorkshire there was a colliery working a thin seam of coal at a great expense, and owing to the coal duty it was at present being worked at a loss. Without the coal duty they would no longer have £12,000 to pay, and there would be no question of whether the colliery should be closed, and 1,000 men be thrown out of employment.

The question was, What was the practical result of this tax? So far as Durham, Yorkshire, Northumberland, and Scotland were concerned it was unjust, inasmuch as they paid all the taxes other industries paid, and this special tax in addition. The right hon. Gentleman did not give a very encouraging reply, so far as the removal of the tax was concerned, to the deputation which waited upon him. The ex-Colonial Secretary, speaking on the coal trade in a mining district recently, told the miners that they were only waiting to be eaten up. The production of coal in Germany, France, and America was increasing with gigantic speed, and in a comparatively few years those countries would become exporters instead of importers of coal. The coal tax was unprecedented in the fiscal system of the country, and operated as a bounty to the foreign producer at the expense of the home producer. It was the confiscation by the Government of £2,000,000 a year from the earnings of the colliery-owners, coal-miners, and shippers engaged in working and exporting coal. It was levied in a manner that was obviously unfair. It was unfair that coal worth 6s. per ton should pay the same tax as coal worth 12s., and it was somewhat ridiculous that it paid the coal-owner better to sell coal at 5s. 11d. than at 6s. 10d. If he sold at 6s. 10d., he had to pay the duty; if he sold at 5s. 11d. he escaped it. There were further inequalities arising from the rates for carriage to the port of shipment. The coal was sold at f.o.b. prices, and if the colliery had to pay 2s. 7d. for carriage, the net receipt was 3s. 6d. and out of that the duty had to be paid, leaving the colliery-owner only 2s. 6d. Yet there might be another colliery producing coal of precisely the same quality in the case of which the cost of carriage was only 6d., and it could afford to sell at 5s. 11d., it escaped the duty and got a net return of 5s. 5d. If the Chancellor of the Exchequer would not remove the duty, it was to be hoped that he would at least consider its incidence, which was most unequal. It would be much fairer to impose a tax of 2d. a ton on the whole coal output of the country, charging half of it to the colliery-owner and half to the royalty-owner. One reason put forward for the introduction of the tax was that it would enable us to husband the coal resources of the country. As a matter of fact it had operated entirely the other way. The price of coal at the pit's mouth had fallen from 3s. to 4s. per ton, and many colliery-owners had been compelled to cease working thin and expensive seams, and we were exhausting the most valuable coal resources of the kingdom far more rapidly than was the case before the tax was imposed. Representing as he did one of the largest coal-mining constituencies in the kingdom, he had felt it his duty to bring this matter under the notice of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. They congratulated him on his early attainment of that most distinguished position, and he could only say that when the deputation waited upon him the other day his experience was that no deputation was ever treated with greater courtesy. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would take into consideration the representations he had made to him with regard to the unfairness of this special tax, and that in some form or other in connection with the Budget, he would so adjust the impost as to render it more equitable.

Sir FREDERICK BANBURY (Camberwell, Peckham) said the last speaker had indulged in a long history of the coal tax, but he could not for the life of him see what that had to do with the Amendment before the House, which was apparently directed to criticising the expenditure incurred by the Government during the last few years. The hon. Gentleman presumably objected to that expenditure, and his objection was particularly to the fact that a certain tax was imposed on an industry in which he was interested. But every industry called upon to bear a tax of course objected to paying it. Still, somebody must pay taxation, and he could not see anything particularly hard in imposing it on the colliery-owner. The hon. Gentleman, too, had said we had learnt a lesson from the war in the East. He seemed to suggest the lesson was that they should not build big battleships, because they might be torpedoed. Well, the Japanese had had no vessels torpedoed, while the Russians had only lost one battleship from that cause.

*Mr. JOSEPH WALTON: More.

Sir FREDERICK BANBURY said the question was, could the Japanese have carried out their operations with torpedo boats had they not had large battleships to cover their movements, and he commended that point to hon. Members' consideration. With regard to the Amendment before the House, the subject had been discussed on public platforms for a good many months. Still it seemed to him to be a strange thing that on so important an occasion there should be only eight Gentlemen on the Opposition

Benches, and only one on the Front Opposition Bench. He considered the small attendance on both sides of the House only confirmed what had been said by the hon. Member for Fulham, viz., that the constituencies were not in favour of severe economy; and hon. Gentlemen opposite were in favour of it only in the abstract. How could we exercise economy? The answer appeared to be simple—by not spending so much. Yet it was only on the preceding Friday afternoon that hon. Members opposite went into the lobby in order to relieve shipowners of a heavy burden which they had had to pay for centuries and which certainly did not constitute an undue burden on their industry, and they sought to put it on the State. Was not that an extraordinary way of advocating economy? Again, very recently hon. Gentlemen opposite voted for the payment of Members. That would have been an additional burden on the State. If they really wanted economy they must give up these small fads. Let them in no way add to the expenditure if they could not reduce it. But could they reduce it? An hon. Member had suggested that a small Army would be more effective. He disagreed with that, and he believed it was an admitted fact that had we had a stronger Army at the outbreak of the Boer War the campaign would have proved much shorter and consequently less expensive. Then again, the hon. Member told them that the training of the men was bad. He believed it was as good as it could possibly be.

*Mr. JOSEPH WALTON: No one else believes it.

Sir FREDERICK BANBURY was sorry there were no Army reformers in the House at the present moment. Money might be wasted in the civilian department, but the training of the men was as good as it had ever been in our history. Even the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean would admit it could not be better.

*Sir CHARLES DILKE dissented.

Sir FREDERICK BANBURY was sorry for that. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman would tell him in what respect he was wrong. He quite agreed that our expenditure now was as high as it ought to be, but it was not wasted expenditure. The outlay on our Army and Navy was a national insurance, and was only sufficient for the proper protection of our Empire in time of need. The House must know we had not yet entered on the millennium, and a weak Army and Navy would only put us in a position to be shot at. The Fashoda incident would not have terminated as it did had our Navy been weak. While we need not be aggressive, we must be prepared to stand up for our own. A question had been asked why the Chancellor of the Exchequer had not increased the burden of indirect taxation in the same proportion as that of the direct taxation, the allusion being presumably to the fact that fourpence had been taken off the income-tax, representing roughly £10,000,000, while indirect taxation had only been reduced £2,500,000. But the hon. Member who asked the question forgot that the income-tax was a war tax.

*Mr. JOSEPH WALTON: So was the tea tax.

Sir FREDERICK BANBURY, continuing, said the tea tax was not touched in the Budget he was referring to. The present expenditure was peace expenditure, and was necessary to maintain the increased obligations of the Empire. Was the hon. Member aware that at the present moment direct taxation represented £1 9s. per head and indirect taxation £1 11s. 2d? But of the latter sum £1 3s. 11d. was obtained from the tobacco, beer, wine, and spirit duties, so that practically a man who neither smoked nor drank only paid 7s. 3d. Surely that was not an unjust burden. Hon. Members who advocated temperance reform ought not to complain if the taxation were raised upon articles which they so strongly condemned. He would suggest that the Chancellor of the Exchequer should be chary in advancing money by local loans. He thought also that the system of grants in aid was not a good one, for it tended to encourage extravagance on the part of municipalities. While he hoped the Front Bench would do all it could to minimise unnecessary expenditure, he trusted there would be no decrease of the outlay on the Army and Navy, which was necessary for the defence of the country.

MR. BUCHANAN (Perthshire, E.) said that practically all the speeches from the other side had asserted that the present debate was unreal, that whoever was responsible for the increase of expenditure, the one set of persons who were not responsible was the Government, and that the Motion under discussion was a mere Party move; but they had invariably wound up by deducing the same conclusion as that put forward by the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition, viz., that the national expenditure was excessive and ought to be diminished. Sweeping and sudden diminutions of expenditure were generally wasteful and uneconomical, but he thought the Government might at any rate go as far as the hon. Member for Peckham, and agree that there should be no further increase in the burdens of the people. He opposed the Bill because it continued war taxation in a time of peace, because of the constantly increasing expenditure of the country, and because there was no provision on the part of the Government, with a view to diminishing the accumulated debt and the increased charges due to the recent war. The Government had forfeited the confidence of the country, and he believed they had forfeited that confidence particularly with regard to their financial policy. The Budget was doubtless an "inevitable" Budget, in the sense that it was the consequence of the policy which had been pursued by the Government during the last few years. As they had sown, so they must reap. But, as one who had opposed the past financial and political policy of the Government, he was entitled to oppose also this "inevitable" Budget.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer had taken credit to himself for not having gone outside the ordinary routine of financial expedients—in fact, for having produced a humdrum Budget. It was indeed a humdrum Budget, but it ought not to have been. It was the first Budget for several years which had not contained any provision for the war expenditure, and if there was a strong claim last year for measures dealing with the serious financial problem caused by the magnitude of the war debt and war expenditure, how much stronger was that claim this year! The Chancellor of the Exchequer ought to have taken a wide survey of the situation and to have laid before the country some general scheme by which, in a reasonable time, the weight of debt might be diminished and some of the burdens of excessive taxation removed. But the right hon. Gentleman had done nothing of the sort. He had strictly limited his view to one year. If he had in his mind a scheme by which he believed our financial position might be improved, but to which he could not in the present circumstances, owing to political or personal reasons, allow free scope, he occupied a false position. If he and the Government of which he was a member really held these opinions upon important financial matters with which they were credited, it was their bounden duty to lay proposals before the country at the earliest possible moment, and obtain, if they could, the freedom of action in financial matters which they professed to desire.

Other speakers had dwelt upon the particularly grave fault of the Budget, that it retained as permanent peace taxation burdens which were imposed as temporary war taxation. They all remembered the appeals of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Bristol that they should take upon their shoulders at least as heavy a portion of the war expenditure as did their ancestors at the time of the Crimean War. Those appeals were cheerfully acceded to on the assurance that the taxation would be removed when the war was over. It was never anticipated that that taxation would become a part of the permanent financial burden of the country. In this connection he would give only one illustration. In the Army Estimates for the year 1900–01 a sum of £6,250,000 was put down for "temporary increases in connection with the war," but five-sixths of those increases had become part of the permanent Army expenditure of the country. There was one kind of increased expenditure for which the present Government was solely responsible. In answer to a Question the First Lord of the Treasury had stated that there were 17,000 troops, costing £2,000,000 a year, under the Colonial Office, and about 5,000 men, costing nearly £250,000, under the Foreign Office. This was expenditure of a military character; it did not appear in the Army Estimates, and it was due to the Imperial colonial policy inaugurated some years ago in Central and West Africa.

With regard to the Debt, the House was entitled to have from the Chancellor of the Exchequer an exact statement of the present position. What was the figure at which the Unfunded Debt now stood? During the last three or four years it had stood at a figure which was absolutely unexampled in the history of the National Debt. According to a recent Return, the Unfunded Debt since 1901 had ranged from £78,000,000 to £73,500,000, an amount three, four, and even six times the ordinary sum. Last year the Chancellor of the Exchequer admitted that the condition of the Unfunded Debt was one of the most serious financial problems, and said that action would be taken in regard to it as soon as possible. The first instalment of the Transvaal Loan had not yet come into their hands. With regard to the Debt, he would like to know what was the exact figure at this moment of the Unfunded Debt, and whether the Chancellor of the Exchequer had any idea as to its possible diminution within the ensuing year or within any fixed period. He believed that £3,000,000 which came from the Transvaal was used for the payment of Exchequer bonds. He understood that since 1st April in the current year by the issue of Treasury bills the Unfunded Debt had been increased by £3,000,000. He believed that that was the case, and so far from reducing debt from the 1st of April they had raised £3,000,000 in Treasury bills and so the actual amount of the Unfunded Debt, if not £3,000,000 larger, at any rate was substantially larger than it was before. That fact had a considerable bearing upon the many proposals and suggestions with regard to the diminution of the Debt which had been suggested by the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

Then there was the question of "other capital liabilities," and these were increasing year by year under various charges. A table appeared in the National Debt Returns from which it appeared that these capital liabilities military and naval works, Uganda Railway, and the rest amounted to £31,861,000; but the House should not imagine that was anything like the total sum expended for these purposes; another £10,000,000 must be added. The Naval Works Act was started with the advantage that the Chancellor of the Exchequer appropriated to that purpose unexpended balances from the years 1896–99, and the amount which in the ordinary course would have gone to the extinction of debt was swept into this whirlpool. This sum of £31,000,000 did not represent the commitments to which this House and the country were bound under the various Acts now in operation, and it seemed almost impossible for anyone to make a reliable estimate upon this subject. The Military Works Acts did not profess to give them any estimate of the total cost of the works, but the Naval Works Acts did give the estimated cost with regard to many of the items, although not in regard to several of the most important items. He thought he was quite within the mark when he said that the total commitments under the various Naval and Military Works Acts amounted to an extra £25,000,000 or £30,000,000. Therefore, if they did not pass any more Military Works Bills, they had before them the certainty of an increase of capital liabilities on a sum equal to that which the country was already saddled with. For the introduction of that system of expenditure on a large scale the present Government alone was responsible, and these lax methods of finance had been adopted by the present Chancellor of the Exchequer and his predecessors under the present Government. This system of borrowing money for public works and making it part of the annual expenditure was as bad as it could be. Upon this point he was glad to see that the Public Accounts Committee had inserted in their Report a very strong expression of opinion in which they stated that this practice led not only to great expenditure, but to the confusion of the accounts, and the Report stated that in the interests of the control of the House over its finances, it was very desirable that they should return to the former practice of putting the money required for naval and military works in the annual Estimates.

There had been under the present Government an increase in the practice of issuing grants-in-aid upon a large and extravagant scale always accompanied by the proviso that the unexpended balances should not be returned to the Exchequer and also with a proviso that in many cases they should not be subject to audit by the Comptroller and Auditor General. The House did possess considerable control over grants-in-aid as long as the Comptroller and Auditor-General possessed the power to audit. It was true that he could not call for the surrender of the balances, but he had the power of seeing that the money was expended within the limits of the audit itself, and that was a very great safeguard. Then again, there was the system of throwing additional burdens upon India and the Colonies and the practice of introducing double budgets in the House for the large spending Departments, and very frequently they had not merely Supplementary Estimates, but in regard to the Army and Navy they frequently introduced a new programme for the year, which led to laxity in the framing of the original Estimates and this practice weakened the control of the House over expenditure. Another thing he regretted was the manner in which the present Government appeared to rely solely upon expert and official advice, for their expenditure upon the Army and Navy was regulated not so much by the advice of the Secretary of State for War and the First Lord of the Admiralty, but by the heads of those great Departments who were military or naval officers. He was afraid this practice would undoubtedly increase more than ever under the new Defence Committee, and he could not help thinking that the operations of this Committee would not conduce to anything like economy or retrenchment. Sir George Clarke himself had stated that it passed human belief to anticipate that when the Defence Committee was in full working order it would not add substantially to our annual expenditure.

Hon. Members opposite said that, after all, this increased expenditure was a question of policy. Of course it was a question of policy on the part of His Majesty's Government which had led to this vast expenditure, and it was only by a reversal of that policy that they might expect to obtain retrenchment and prosperity. They wanted a spirit of peace abroad and sympathy with liberty and not with autocracy, and if they got that they would be in the way of making a long stride towards economy. They had to convert the country to their side, and he thought they were in process of doing it. It was a great mistake to assume that the country was not waking up to the necessity of economy. There was no doubt that in the country the people were awakening and realising the enormous increase in our national expenditure; and when the poorer classes felt this increase of taxation they would demand from whichever Party obtained a majority at the next election that there should be retrenchment in expenditure and a reduction in the immediate future. They did not want panic reductions in expenditure, but they wanted both Parties in the State committed to real retrenchment and real reduction. They must cut their coat according to their cloth, abandon the loan and grant-in-aid system, and make a serious effort to diminish the war debt, without waiting for that £30,000,000 from the Transvaal, which might possibly never come at all. They wanted no more doles, no more Licensing Bills, no more Irish Land Purchase Bills, no more pursuits of Mad Mullahs through the deserts of Africa, and no more "peaceful" Missions to Tibet. They must insist upon a reduction of the Army to a number which was sufficient to meet the necessities of Home defence and the defence of India, and a halt must be called in the permanent and continuous increase in the Navy. In the year 1899–1900, the First Lord of the Admiralty, Lord Goschen, told the House, when he was asking for £27,000,000 for the Navy, that that sum was sufficient to give them the naval force they needed, but now the Government had raised that sum to £43,000,000. The sum of £8,000,000 was then considered sufficient for new construction, and why should they require now nearly £12,000,000 for this purpose, because all the arguments pointed in the opposite direction? At the present time they saw one of their greatest naval rivals being seriously injured in the war which was going on in the Far East. France was now their only naval rival in the Mediterranean, which was packed with British ships. Surely if the recent agreement with France was a real, substantial, and beneficent one it ought to lead both in the spirit, and in regard to the practical results which would follow, not merely to greater amity between the two nations, but also to a substantial alleviation of the burden of armaments both in this country and in France.

Mr. WINSTON CHURCHILL (Oldham) said the Chancellor of the Exchequer would not, he thought, be surprised when he rose to support the Amendment which had been moved from the Benches opposite; but he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would not think that he addressed the House that evening in any way hostile, personally or politically, to himself. He had usually got on very well with Chancellors of the Exchequer. They had usually regarded him and others who sat on that Bench as right-minded and industrious Members of Parliament, and he would remind the right hon. Gentleman that his two immediate predecessors were so impressed with the strength, the force, and the cogency of the financial criticisms from the Back Benches and from below the Gangway, that they had resigned their offices and come to help in the supply of that criticism. He was tempted to recollect how strong the influence of the Treasury might be. The most obdurate politicians seemed to have their opinions altered under Treasury influence, which was almost stronger than that of the Board of Trade, and yet they knew that twenty years ago the Board of Trade was strong enough to produce a very decided effect upon a political leader who was not usually able to come within outside influence. There seemed to be something about the air of 11, Downing Street peculiarly exhilarating, something which not only gave to the occupant of that building clear views on financial questions but which very often imparted to him the courage of a martyr and the most unalterable convictions. It was all the more remarkable that the atmosphere should have that effect when they reflected upon the obscurity which prevailed at the residence of the Prime Minister next door, and the very dangerous and poisonous fumes which, until a recent date, issued from the Colonial Office across the road. It would be quite easy to chaff the Chancellor of the Exchequer upon the very odd and anomalous position he occupied in regard to the Budget. He was a convinced tariff reformer as he told them during the holidays at Birmingham, and yet he had introduced a free-trade Budget, and he was defending that with force, fluency, and conviction. His right hon. friend believed it was profitable to raise revenue by taxing the foreigner, and yet the right hon. Gentleman selected as the principal subject of his Budget, tea—that commodity which all politicians, from the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham to the hon. Member for Islington, were agreed was a vital and indispensable necessity in the household of every working man. That was a subject which the right hon. Gentleman had selected for taxation, although he knew that the greater part came to these shores not as part of an insidious design or treacherous intrigue on the part of a foreign country, but as part of a free and generous Imperial sentiment which animated one of our most deserving colonies. By a strange concatenation of events, the right hon. Gentleman filled a great position of responsibility. He was surrounded by peculiar public and still more peculiar personal difficulties, and he was bound to say that he seemed to have tried his best to do his duty according to the best traditions of the finance of this country As a sincere though he hoped not a pedantic free-trader, he should certainly not say anything calculated to discourage his right hon. friend from the path of virtue on which he had embarked, or disturb in any way the wholesome process of conversion which was evidently going on.

Whatever opinion might be entertained as to the propriety of the discussion which the Leader of the Opposition had raised, there was no dispute at all as to the actual facts. They might differ as to the cause and their consequences, and they might argue in regard to the excuses which the Government might offer, but of the sudden, immense, alarming, unprecedented increase and expansion in the national expenditure and of the very serious situation created thereby, there was no difference of opinion on either side of the House, nor even between people who sat on the same side of the House. He was not going to quote the figures. It was quite enough to say that the government of the country cost half as much again as it did when the Unionist Government, in 1895, came into power. Was it governed half as well again? In the same period the armaments, or rather the expenditure for the armaments, was doubled. Had they divided their dangers? Was it not true that the same policy which had doubled the armaments had halved the security, so that we remained in relatively the same position, faced by the same dangers as twenty years ago. £26,000,000 of taxation imposed during the war for the purposes of the war, and voted by that House under the emotions of the war, had taken their place in the regular ordinary permanent taxation of the country. The war was over, the taxation went on. But that was not all. Their expenditure was advancing by leaps and bounds and had in fact acquired a momentum of its own. Many important changes were maturing in the Army and Navy, and there was an automatic, steady, progressive increase in expenditure. It was said by one speaker that afternoon that the whole vast business had got out of hand. Like an estate in the hands of a spendthrift, our financial position was steadily deteriorating, and our finances were becoming more and more demoralised.

He had done his best to bring this question of economy forward during the time he had been in the House. He did not know when a general election was to come. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham said it would come within "a reasonable time," and the Prime Minister agreed with him in that as in everything else. The Prime Minister's idea of a reasonable time would, if he expressed his whole meaning, be found to coincide very nearly with the limits of the Septennial Act. Whether he himself would be fortunate enough to hold a seat in this House after the general election he could not tell. It was a matter of considerable uncertainty, he admitted; but, if he should be so fortunate as to be there on the day when the great transference of power took place, he should like to warn the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition that he should do his best to pursue the same economic performances he had hitherto devoted himself to, and that, unless the incoming Government made a substantial reduction both in naval and military expenditure, he should do his best to be a plague to the right hon. Gentleman. He supposed his quarrel with the Government was now quite irreparable. The Prime Minister had dismissed him formally from the number of his supporters. [AN HON. MEMBER: No wonder.] Perhaps the hon. Gentleman behind him would be very glad if he and some others who sat near him were to go and sit on the other side of the House? If he consulted his own inclinations he should certainly do so, but there were other things to be considered than that. And, besides, the established practice of that House had been that Members had a right to choose where they would sit, and it had been assumed that other Members would accept their decision with tolerance and good humour—more than that was not asked of them. Since his quarrel with the Government had become serious, he should like to say that it had been solely and entirely on the question of finance. It was on finance that he was drawn to attack the Army scheme of 1900; it had been mainly on finance that he had been drawn to oppose the fiscal proposals of the right hon. Gentleman. Extravagant finance would in the long run drag this powerful Government to the ground. Extravagant finance was written on the head of their indictment, and it would be written on the head of their tombstone. No doubt the old familiar arguments would be advanced in reply. If expenditure was appalling, it was said, "Never mind, it is popular." If trade and employment fell off, it was said it improved recruiting for the Army, and for the Tariff Reform League also according to the right hon. Member for Birmingham. If Consols and other gilt-edged securities were depreciated, what matter? it was no longer necessary to reduce the interest on savings in the Post Office. Above all, if the domestic situaproved embarrassing, distraction could be sought for in foreign war. There was brilliancy in decay; the human body preyed on itself and gained a feverish energy in the process of exhaustion. When expenditure increased waste increased. He did not make that as a special charge against this Government. It was true of all Governments. The expenditure of the country had bounded up in a great measure, and it was obvious that the proportion of waste and unprofitable expenditure must be actually and relatively great.

The expenditure of the country required a critical examination periodically by some one not concerned in it. That examination was usually made by a succeeding Government of a different political Party who surveyed the whole body of expenditure from a point of view entirely different from that of their predecessors. But as this was the second term of office which the present Government was enjoying, the ordinary working of that healthy constitutional check had been prevented, and therefore extravagance and waste had been progressive and cumulative. Two years ago the hon. Member for Exeter and the hon. Member for Lynn Regis asked the Prime Minister to appoint a Committee to inquire into the matter of examining the Estimates. The Committee was appointed; it sat, and examined witnesses, and made some moderate recommendations as to the way in which the Estimates should be examined. What had happened? The Report had fallen somewhere to the ground between the two Front Benches, and he was afraid that it was irretrievably lost. Control of expenditure did not depend upon control of details. Control of expenditure depended upon policy; and the present expenditure would never be checked and curbed until there was a complete change of policy. There was the Army. He hoped there would be an opportunity given for discussing how much the scheme of 1901 had really cost the taxpayers, and he trusted it would never be forgotten how this scheme, though from the first known to be absolutely unsuited to our needs, was cynically carried on, and how the whole system of the Army was altered in the vain attempt to make it work. Then there was Somaliland, upon which £2,500,000 had been spent. Then there was the peaceful Mission to Tibet. That subject did not arise on the Finance Bill, because the charge fell upon the Indian taxpayers; but he trusted that an opportunity would be afforded before the Whitsuntide adjournment for discussing not only the immediate security of the forces employed in Tibet, but the moral and political considerations involved in that most unworthy and unprovoked act of aggression and crime. He agreed that now was the time for effecting a reduction in the Navy. Such a chance would not recur again. The other day a first-class Russian battleship was sunk, and disappeared as if she had never existed. If our calculations for the strength of the Navy were not exaggerated before, obviously the Government could strike off one first-class battleship from their naval programme to counterbalance the Russian ship which had been destroyed. It was possible that there might be a still greater reduction in the Russian fleet. Surely here was a chance for the Government. Why not go to the Russian Government and say "You have lost your ships of war; but never mind we will make a proportionate reduction in our Fleet in order to counterbalance your losses."

They had no right to say that the House of Commons was responsible for this expenditure; it was the Executive alone that was responsible. He did not deny that a great portion of the expenditure was due to the South African War. He said nothing about that war; he was tarred with responsibility, in his own small way, as much as anyone on this side of the House for acquiescing in that immense public disaster. The effect of the war had been two-fold; it had seriously increased the cost of our administration and disordered our finances, and it had totally changed, in the minds of the public departments, the scale of our armaments and general administration. The Government had taken full advantage of that change; they had found in the spending of money an easy solution for almost every Parliamentary and electoral difficulty, and had indulged in almost every conceivable financial irregularity. It was on a financial situation such as that that the right hon. Member for West Birmingham launched his fiscal proposals. He had no personal feeling whatever against the right hon. Gentleman; like a good many others he objected to his emissaries being sent down to disturb his own constituency while the right hon. Gentleman was a member of the Government, although in favour of a policy of which the Government did not approve. He was sorry the right hon. Gentleman was not present, he would much rather say these things in his presence. Since the right hon. Gentleman had regularised his position by his resignation, no one had any right to prefer a complaint other than of a purely political character against him; he had made a sacrifice, how great he was perhaps now beginning to realise. If they had received rough treatment from the right hon. Gentleman they had at any rate received fair treatment from him. If they deplored his action, they did not deny his right, or that of any other private Member, to use to the full his influence in bringing to a constitutional decision a great question. But when the right hon. Gentleman returned from South Africa a great opportunity had been presented him. The finance of this country required a period of what Lord Rosebery called "recuperative repose," the public expenditure needed control, and the public departments required reorganisation. The right hon. Gentleman occupied a position of prestige and power unequalled in the country; the Government, on the other hand, were in difficulties, embarrassed by the Army scheme and a want of money, a want that would cling to them as long as they were in office. The part of a prudent statesman, even of a good Party man, would surely have been to try to do something to heal the scars of war and enable the country to recover from the sacrifices which it had been willing to make. No one else had the courage, the influence, or the business capacity, and if the right hon. Gentleman had found it possible to enter on such a campaign, many Members on both sides —certainly on this side — would have been proud to give him all the effective support in their power. The right hon. Gentleman chose a different course; instead of repose he chose agitation, instead of retrenchment, profusion, instead of financial recovery, fiscal reform! When he entered on that course, so full of peril, it carried him further and further from all the great traditions of the British Government and finance. There was another reason why the right hon. Gentleman should have exercised restraint. He was the Minister responsible for Africa. On the faith of his judgment and on the strength of his appeals this country had backed his policy through thick and thin; thousands of soldiers had lost their lives, many millions had been spent. If ever a man was under an obligation to devote the whole of his time and attention to African policy it was the Colonial Secretary. But the right hon. Gentleman cast that grim African obligation away as a child would throw away a costly broken toy, and plunged at once upon another enterprise, another adventure, as vast, as dangerous, as uncalculated, as uncontrollable as the one from which he had barely emerged. No doubt the right hon. Gentleman's emotions were not sordid or selfish, but he thought he would not easily escape at the bar of history a charge, damaging to his reputation, of having abandoned without sufficient pretext or justification, a post which it was his duty to defend.

MR. SPEAKER: I must not allow the hon. Member to make an attack upon the late Colonial Secretary for not continuing in his post. It is not relevant to the question either of expenditure or of taxation.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL said he was only referring to the financial position of the country owing to the policy of the right hon. Gentleman. Of course, he would not pursue that further. At the cost of some personal friendships, the breaking of Party ties, and the disturbance of the financial position, the right hon. Gentleman's fiscal proposals had been checked and arrested. If the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham wished to measure the results of his policy during the past year he had only to contrast the reception given to his speech on 15th May, 1903, with that accorded to his speech on 12th

May, 1904. What was the position, in the meanwhile, of His Majesty's Government? The Secretary of State for India, who was nothing if not modest, informed them that—presumably since he left the War Office—the position of the Government had been one of riotous triumph. The Prime Minister was entitled to congratulate himself on a very remarkable achievement. After a year of fiscal and financial discussion no one knew whether the right hon. Gentleman was convinced that a 10 per cent. duty would be a good thing or a bad thing for the country; no one knew what fiscal reform meant, or what retaliation and anti-dumping actually meant.

MR. SPEAKER: I think this is not relevant to the Bill. It may be relevant to a Motion that is coming on on Wednesday.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL said that, with great respect, he was discussing the position of the Government as a matter relevant to the decision of the House on the Finance Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: I differ from the hon. Member. I do not think that he is entitled on the Finance Bill to discuss the whole policy or conduct of the Government.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL said he bowed to Mr. Speaker's ruling. After the next election was over, the Prime Minister and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham would be the leaders of a strong and united Party, but they would not be leaders of the same Party but of a new Party. The course of financial events would alter the relations of those who now supported them. It would be a Party which had taken new ideas. It would not be a Party attached to the old traditions of old finance, or the old constitutional ideas which the Conservative Party had so long respected. It would be a Party with a test, and that test would be a tariff.

The Leader of the Opposition, in the course of his speech that day had referred to what he called "claptrap Imperialism." All Imperialism was not "clap-trap." But there were two kinds of Imperialism. There was the Imperialism of the camp, about which some of them who were leaving the protectionist Party knew something, and there was the Imperialism of the caucus, about which they had known something during the last few months. They ought to distinguish between the amateur Imperialists who gave their lives on the field, and the professional Imperialists who got their living by practising it in politics; they ought to distinguish between the sentiment which united us to our Colonies, and that bastard Imperialism which was ground out by a Party machine and was convenient for placing a particular set of Gentlemen in power. Speaking generally on the question of Imperialism as connected with finance, he cared a great deal more for the old Constitution of our country than for the cheap and flashy doctrine of Imperialism of which they had lately heard so much. But this Budget was the last of its kind. By the time the next Budget was presented, in all probability one of two things would have happened. Either a fundamental change would have taken place, owing to a Liberal free-trade victory at the polls, which would impose a change upon policy and consequently upon expenditure, or we should be listening to proposals of a general protectionist character. He ventured to predict to the right hon. Gentleman that if this vast expenditure continued it would not fail to raise the great labour issue. One would hardly think that finance was the governing factor in the whole political situation. It was not until the heavy burden had to be distributed that the combat of classes really began, and now, behind a perfect array of minor questions, such as graduated income-tax and the financial relations with Ireland, there began to rise up from slumber the two great giants, labour and protection. They might make model speeches in favour of economy, or appoint Committees of supervision or control, but the harm was done, the consequences were upon them. Be they evil or be they good, they would have to be faced, and before these two paramount issues were laid to rest, or carried into effect, the whole face of English politics would be altered, and of the existing Party arrangements, Party grouping, perhaps Party watch-words hardly a vestige would remain.

*MR. RENWICK (Newcastle-on-Tyne) said that everyone interested in government by Party must acknowledge that the speech to which the House had just listened ought to have been made from the other side. He thought the speech was notable for two things: first, for the fact that they had at last got an inkling of what hon. Members opposite meant by economy, and secondly, it was evidently prepared in the hope that the right hon. Member for West Birmingham would be present, and that it would draw the right hon. Gentleman into a general debate on fiscal policy. One could hardly have recognised in the speech of the hon. Member that he was so lately one of the most enthusiastic supporters of the Government in re-imposing the corn duty. The hon. Member had said that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had brought in a humdrum Budget. The same opinion had been expressed over and over again on the other side of the House. The hon. Gentleman in 1902 heartily supported the corn tax, and if that tax had not been taken off probably they would not have had such a humdrum Budget. The hon. Gentleman said that because a Russian battleship had been sunk, the Government ought to curtail its shipbuilding programme; but he maintained that if ever there was a time when it was absolutely necessary to keep up an efficient Navy, now was the time. Did Japan wait for the outbreak of war before ordering their ships? No; the Government of that country had their ships built in time of peace. Shipbuilders might be patriotic, but their patriotism would not allow them to build ships without a profit. Orders should be given in times of peace. It was too late to do so when war was contemplated, for then shipbuilders would require a larger profit and workmen would demand larger wages, and the expenditure would be correspondingly higher.

There was one point in which he thoroughly agreed with the junior Member for Oldham, and that was the regret with which he regarded the raising of the tea duty from 6d. to 8d. He like the hon. Member represented a large manufacturing constituency, and for many years he had made speeches advocating the reduction of the tea duty on the ground that tea had become an absolute necessity of life. He looked forward to the time when, by a re-arrangement of our fiscal system, we should be able to reduce the taxation on tea. He did not agree with the hon. Member for Oldham that we ought to enter on a period of recuperative repose. That might suit Lord Rosebery and his followers, but it would not suit this country, which was accustomed to an active life and an active policy. He was perfectly aware that his friends opposite would like to get rid of the responsibilities of our Empire, and would like to cut down the Empire. But the nation was bound to protect every part of the Empire, and they on that side of the House were not afraid of taking the responsibility. The Empire had brought this country wealth and greatness, and all means must be adopted which were necessary to maintain it. What the country was suffering from at the present time was a financial policy, which was based on a too narrow basis of taxation. A broader basis of taxation must be adopted. Those who clamoured for economy and the decrease of taxation were the very persons who were always agitating for the increase of wages of Government servants, or the payment of expenses of returning officers at elections, payment of Members, and the like. A few days ago a deputation waited on the First Lord of the Admiralty and pleaded for an increase of the wages of dock labourers, and the First Lord told them that money did not fall like manna from Heaven. While not enthusiastic in regard to the Finance Bill, he thought the Chancellor of the Exchequer's proposals were safe, and he would consider it his duty to support them.

*MR. THEODORE TAYLOR (Lancashire, Radcliffe) said it had been alleged that the House of Commons was largely responsible for the increase of expenditure. He was aware that the average Member of the House of Commons was not sufficiently impressed with the necessity for national economy. He, for one, would vote against every extravagance, even if it were proposed by a Liberal Government. When hon. Members talked to each other privately, all admitted that the present expenditure was too large. The Chancellor of the Exchequer and others had said that there was not much demand for economy, but he thought the right hon. Gentleman would see, when he came to meet his constituents, that there was a considerable demand for economy. The great bulk of the population were not men of considerable means; and many had very great difficulties in making ends meet. That was a class who were sufficiently large to claim the attention of this House, and that was the class who were very often on the verge of hunger. He made no apology for speaking for that class. Not only from this country but from Ireland they were emigrating every year in large numbers. There must be something wrong when, as a friend wrote him the other day, by one steamer a thousand young people left their native country, because they could not get their living in it. The condition of the very poor was so serious that it really needed their sympathy. He was sure that every hon. Member was a humane man; and that if it depended on individuals they would not vote for taxation which pressed on the very poor. National extravagance was bad for the nation because it begot self-indulgence; self-indulgence begot luxury; and luxury begot decay and ruin. To fight for economy was the duty not only of the Chancellor of the Exchequer but of every hon. Member, just as much as it would be his duty to fight for his country in time of war, and if they did not do their duty they were poor patriots and defaulting trustees. In no spirit of sordid meanness but as a matter of duty they should see that the nation's money was wisely spent. The expenditure of the country had increased enormously in proportion to their real requirements. Justice and humanity demanded that they should relieve the very poor of their burdens. Heavy taxation of the poor was that form of taxation least profitable to the State. It was not only unfair to the poor but it made the trade of the country worse. The very poor were the class that spent all they got, and that meant that if taxes took anything from them by raising the price of tea and sugar they must spend less on articles of consumption. If they lessened the people's income so much less would be spent on commodities produced by the rest of the community, and in that way the war taxation was producing bad trade in the country. Sir Robert Giffen had estimated that about 72 per cent. of the expenditure of the whole community was on food, dress, and housing—the absolute essentials of life—and if that were the proportion for the whole community, it was probable that the working classes spent 90 per cent. of their income on such essentials.

Of new taxes imposed since the war began, there yet remained £25,250,000 a year. Their total expenditure was too large. If they wanted to test that, they could compare their expenditure with other countries. He knew that it would be said that such a comparison was hardly fair, because of the burden of Imperial defence, but surely the time was not far distant when some of their statesmen would endeavour to devise some scheme by which the Colonies would bear a fair share in the defence of the Empire and at the same time have some share in its government. India the poorest part of the Empire paid for its own defence, but there were other parts of the Empire which did not pay anything like their fair share as compared with the United Kingdom, and until they had some such scheme as he suggested, and until other parts of the Empire contributed a share to its defence, they could not hope for much improvement. He agreed with the Leader of the Opposition that the country had got into its present position through a policy of drift, and by allowing men in charge on the limits of the Empire to have too much of their own way. Only the other day he heard the Prime Minister state that this country was going to withdraw from Tibet; but now they were told that the expedition would advance. He thought, however, that this country ought to contribute to the cost of that expedition and that India should not be saddled with it all. It seemed to him that until they abandoned this policy of drift and altered the tone of their policy not only would the country have to provide for all rightful defence, but would also have to meet the cost of a continuance of little wars that kept developing into big wars. Surely one way to avoid such expenditure was that their public men should adopt a modest and not a boastful tone. Certainly the country would have to pay for boastful talk such as references to "the long spoon" and to "the sands running out" by men of great international fame. No man could boast in private life without losing by it; and if they boasted as a nation they would have to pay for it sooner or later. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Bristol said in his constituency the other day that this country should attract the sympathy of its great Colonies by respecting both them and herself, and in regard to foreign nations that it should carry out the golden rule of doing to others as they would wish others to do unto it. It was by that policy, he added, and that policy alone, that the welfare and greatness of the country would be maintained. That exactly described the policy they ought to follow. The one great reason for the expenditure they now had to incur was that this country had excited to an unnecessary extent the jealousy and hostility of foreign nations, and also, perhaps, to a certain extent because of the attitude of their own countrymen who thought that unless they were cock-a-hoop they could not be properly alive.

Let them compare the expenditure now with what it was ten or twenty years ago. Including the licence duties which were paid to the local taxation account and also the Military and Naval Works Loans, the expenditure in 1883–4 was nearly £86,000,000 and in 1893–4 £99,344,000, or an increase of over 15 per cent. In 1903–4 the expenditure was £164,000,000, or an increase over the expenditure of 1893–4 of 65 per cent. and an increase of 90 per cent. as compared with the expenditure twenty years ago, That was really an astounding increase; and even if they allowed for the increase in population, which was 20 per cent., it meant an increase in expenditure of 60 per cent. In his young days he had heard of "bloated armaments" but if the man who used that expression twenty or twenty-five years ago were still alive, what phrase would he use now? It was no point at all to say that the municipal expenditure of the country had also greatly increased. If the municipalities were extravagant it was all the more reason why the State should be economical; not why the State should attempt to rival the municipalities in extravagance. He had heard extravagance advocated on the ground that it would put money into the pockets of the working classes, and set the wheels of trade going. That was a perfectly rotten argument, and was absolutely contrary to political economy. There could be no better illustration of the difference between sensible and extravagant expenditure than a comparison between, for instance, £100,000 spent on a warship and £100,000 spent on a merchant ship. The warship was unproductive—not only unproductive but continuously costly; but after a year or two the merchant ship yielded a return in the form of a dividend to its owners. That was an illustration of the difference between the continuous effect of extravagant expenditure and the continuous effect of wasteful expenditure. It also explained why trade was so much worse after a great war. Money spent on war was wasteful expenditure which might be spent on reproductive works, which after a year or two would be earning money for the country. It was because of the money spent on the war that trade was as it was, and that employment was decreasing. Another illustration of the difference between extravagant and reasonable national expenditure was the case of Egypt. Lord

Cromer in his marvellous consular report last year on Egypt taught a lesson to every financier of every country and every time. He stated that he knew perfectly well that he was keeping the country short as regarded expenditure on judiciary and police, but that he did that purposely in order that money might fructify in the pockets of the people. It did fructify, and the result was that the condition of Egypt had greatly improved. If they in this country also allowed money to fructify in the pockets of the people they would reap the benefit of it in time. Extravagant expenditure was bad for a country. They saw Consols falling in this country while Egyptian government securities were rising in value; and it would actually have been better for the finances of this country if they had been controlled by a benevolent despot such as Lord Cromer than to have been as they were under the control of this Government.

Motion made, and Question, "That the debate be now adjourned"—(*Lord Alwyne Compton*)—put, and agreed to.

Debate to be resumed to-morrow.

Adjourned at nine minutes after Twelve o'clock.

APPENDICES.

APPENDIX I.

PUBLIC BILLS

DEALT WITH IN VOLUME CXXXIV.

Those marked thus * are Government Bills. The figures in parentheses in the last column refer to the page in this volume. "[H.L.]" following title indicates that the Bill originated in the Lords.

(A.) HOUSE OF LORDS.

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
*Bills of Exchange Act (1882) Amendment [H.L.]	*Lord Chancellor*	Read 2^{a} 9th May (735) Committee 13th May (1273)
Education (Transferred Schools) [H.L.]	*Lord Bishop of St. Asaph*	Read 1^{a} 9th May (754)
*Merchant Shipping [H.L.]	*Lord Wolverton*	Read 2^{a} 9th May (722)
*Open Spaces [H.L.]	*Earl of Onslow*	Read 2^{a} 5th May (499)
Prevention of Corruption [H.L.]	*Lord Alverstone*	Committee 9th May (734)
*Prize Courts [H.L.]	*Lord Chancellor*	Read 2^{a} 9th May (734)
Re-vaccination [H.L.]	*Duke of Northumberland*	Read 1^{a} 16th May (1359)
Sale of Intoxicants to Children [H.L.]	*Lord Alverstone*	Report 2nd May (76) Read 3^{a} and passed 5th May (496)
*Sea Fisheries [H.L.]	*Earl of Onslow*	Read 3^{a} and passed 2nd May (85)
Street Betting [H.L.]	*Lord Davey*	Read 2^{a} 3rd May (223) Committee 10th May (867)
*Supply of Electricity [H.L.]	*Lord Wolverton*	Read 2^{a} 13th May (1288)
Weights and Measures (Metric System) [H.L.]	*Lord Belhaven*	Committee 13th May (1273) Report 16th May (1359)

(B) HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
Aged Pensioners	*Mr. Remnant*	Read 2^{o} 6th May (669)
*Bishopric of Southwark and Birmingham	*Mr. A. J. Balfour*	Read 2^{o} 4th May (397)

(B.) HOUSE OF COMMONS—*continued.*

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
*Constabulary (Ireland)	*Mr. Wyndham*	Read 1° 10th May (899)
*Education (Scotland)	*Mr. Graham Murray*	Read 2° 2nd May (128) (186)
*Finance	*Mr. Austen Chamberlain*	Read 1° 3rd May (366) Second Reading (adjourned) 16th May (1400) (1463)
*Licensing	*Mr. Akers Douglas*	Second Reading 9th May (778) (845) Second Reading 10th May (899) (965) Second Reading 11th May (1033)
Local Government (Ireland) Acts Amendment	*Mr. Field*	Second Reading defeated 29th April (17)
Local Government (Scotland)	*Mr. Maxwell*	Read 1° 5th May (550)
Merchandise Marks	*Sir Howard Vincent*	Read 1° 2nd May (128)
Merchant Shipping (Lighthouses)	*Mr. Plummer*	Read 2° 13th May (1299)
Old Age Pensions (No. 3)	*Sir James Rankin*	Bill withdrawn 6th May (700)
Outdoor Relief (Friendly Societies) (No. 3)	*Sir Edward Strachey*	Read 1° 6th May (700)
Parliamentary Voters Registration	*Mr. Cremer*	Read 1° 9th May (778)
Registration of Clubs (Ireland)	*Mr O'Neill*	Read 2° 6th May (648)
Re-vaccination	*Sir John Tuke*	Bill withdrawn 6th May (700)
*Solicitors	*Sir Robert Finlay*	Read 1° 16th May (1400)
Sunday Trading (Scotland)	*Mr. C. Corbett*	Read 1° 3rd May (272)

APPENDIX II.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, SESSION 1904.

LIST OF RULES, ORDERS, &c., which have been presented during the Session, and are required by Statute to lie for an appointed number of Days upon the Table of the House.

[*In continuance of List given in preceding Volume.*]

Title of Paper.	Date from which the Period runs.	Period to lie upon the Table.
Royal Parks and Gardens, — Copy of Rules for the Royal Parks and Gardens, in connection with the Regulations prescribed by The Parks Regulation Act, 1872 [35 and 36 Vic., c. 15, s. 9.]	29 April	One month
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge Act, 1877 (Cambridge),—Copy of Statutes made by the Governing Body of Trinity College, Cambridge, on 7th December 1903, amending Statutes XXVIII., XXIX., XXXI., XLI., XLII., XLIX., LIV., and LXI. of the College Statutes [40 and 41 Vic., c. 48, s. 50.]	29 April	12 weeks
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge Act, 1877 (Oxford),—Copy of Statute made by the Governing Body of Brasenose College, Oxford, on 9th December 1903, amending Statutes II., III., IV., V., X., XII., XIII., XV., XVI., and XVII. of the College Statutes [25 and 26, Vic. c. 26, s. 7.]	29 April	12 weeks
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge Act, 1877 (Oxford),—Copy of Statute made by the Governing Body of Balliol College, Oxford, on 15th December 1903, amending Statute V., Clause 3 (a), of the Statutes of the College [25 and 26 Vic., c. 26, s. 7.]	29 April	12 weeks
Irish Land Commission (Rules),—Copy of Rules made in pursuance of Section 88, sub-section 5, of the Irish Land Act, 1903, dated the 23rd April 1904 [3 Edw. VII., c. 37, s. 92]	2 May	40 days
Victoria (The Electoral Districts Boundaries Act, 1903),—Copy of the Electoral Districts Boundaries Act, 1903 (Victoria), No. 1895 [13 and 14 Vic., c. 59, s. 32]	5 May	30 days
Victoria (The Electoral Provinces Boundaries Act, 1903), —Copy of the Electoral Provinces Boundaries Act, 1903 (Victoria), No. 1896 [13 and 14 Vic., c. 59, s. 32]	5 May	30 days
Board of Education (Code, 1904),—Copy of Code of Regulations for Public Elementary Schools, with Schedules, by the Board of Education [33 and 34 Vic., c. 75, s. 97]	13 May	One month
Irish Land Commission (Rules),—Copy of Rule made by the Irish Land Commission under the Land Purchase Acts, dated the 23rd April 1904 [3 Edw. VII., c. 37, s. 92]	10 May	40 sitting days
Prisons (Scotland),—Copy of Rule made by the Secretary for Scotland as to the Constitution of the Visiting Committee to Inverness Prison [40 and 41 Vic., c. 53, s. 58]	11 May	40 days
Inebriates Acts, 1879 to 1899 (Regulations for State Inebriate Reformatories),—Copy of Regulations made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, in pursuance of The Inebriates Act, 1898, for the management and discipline of State Inebriate Reformatories [61 and 62 Vic., c. 60, s. 21 (1)]	12 May	4 weeks (whilst the House is sitting)

INDEX

TO THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

[AUTHORISED EDITION].

FIFTH VOLUME OF SESSION 1904.

APRIL 29—MAY 16.

EXPLANATION OF ARRANGEMENT AND ABBREVIATIONS.

Bills: Read First, Second, or Third Time = 1R., 2R., 3R. [*c.*] = Commons. [*l.*] = Lords. *Amendt.* = Amendment. *Os.* = Observations. *Qs.* = Questions. *As.* = Answers. *Com.* = Committee. *Con.* = Consideration. Where in the Index * is added with Reading of a Bill, or a Vote in Committee of Supply, it indicates that no Debate took place on that Stage of the Bill, or on that Vote. Subjects discussed in Committee of Supply are entered under their headings, and also under Members' Names, without reference to the actual Vote before the Committee.

Aberdeen, Earl of
Street Betting Bill, 2R., *May 3*, 233; *Com. May 10*, 873.

Abraham, Mr. W. [Cork Co., N.E.]
Bank of Ireland, Government Moneys passing through, tabling Terms of Agreement as to, *May 5*, 544; *May 12*, 1157.

Kingston Estate, Cork—Sale to Tenants—Terms of Sale—Instituting Inquiries, etc, *May 11*, 1023.

Mallow Recreation Ground—Reason for Refusing Provisional Order to acquire Land, *May 12*, 1178.

Accidents
Fatal—Open Fire Grates, causing, granting Return relative to.
Q. Mr. A. Henderson; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *April 29*, 13–14.

Railway, Returns as to, and Reports on, presented, *May 5*, 495.

Achonry
Schools—Name of Manager—Appointing Rev. B. Dunn, etc.
Qs. Mr. O'Dowd; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 9*, 767–768, *May 12*, 1175.

Achonry Estate, Co. Sligo
Sale of, to Congested Districts Board.
Q. Mr. O'Dowd; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 2*, 121, 122.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A.—*Parliamentary Secretary of the Treasury* [Somersetshire, Wellington]
Port of London Bill—Date of resuming debate on, *May 11*, 1144.

Adjournment of the House
Motion for, being an abuse of the Rules, refusal of Speaker to propose the question, *May 3*, 367.

Admiralty
First Lord—Earl of Selborne.
Financial Secretary—Mr. E. G. Pretyman.

Africa, East
Agricultural Report presented, *May 3*, 223, 238.

Steamship Communication with, subsidising, proposed.
Committee of Inquiry—Constitution and Terms of Reference.
Q. Mr. E. Cecil, *May 2*, 111; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, 112.

India, Contribution from.
Q. Mr. Buchanan, *May 2*, 112; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, 112.

Africa, South
Census—Date of Return.
Qs. Major Seely; *As.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 2*, 107.

Chartered Company — Jameson Raid Claim against.
Q. Mr. Pirie; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 3*, 245-246.

[*cont.*

Africa, South—*cont.*
Crown Agents, Purchases for, *see under title* Crown Agents for the Colonies.
Finance—Government control over Lord Milner, References to, in debate on the Finance Bill, *May 16*, 1421, 1424.
Immigration Regulations in.
 Q. Mr. Brigg; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 4*, 380.
Jameson Raid, Indemnity for — Claim against the Chartered Company.
 Q. Mr. Pirie; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 3*, 245–246.
Labour in, *see* Transvaal—Chinese Labour *and* Labour Question.
Military Policy of the Government, want of Continuity in, References to, in Debate on the Finance Bill, *May 16*, 1424, 1425.
Swaziland — Refunding Customs Duties paid to Transvaal Government.
 Q. Mr. J. Bailey; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 12*, 1166.
Transvaal, Orange River Colony, Cape Colony, *see those titles.*

Africa, West
Congo, *see that title.*

Aged Pensioners Bill
c. 2R. *May 6*, 669.
Debate on Second Reading [Commons] *May 6*, 669.
 Advantages of the Measure, 672, 687, 688, 691.
 Age Qualification, 669.
 Agricultural Labourers, position of, 683.
 Aliens, provisions as to, 671.
 Amount to be given as Pension, 669.
 Children, Responsibility of well-to-do, for their Parents, Powers as to Recovery from, of sums spent, 671.
 Committee of Administration and Control, Constitution and Duties of, 670, 671, 679.
 Cost of Pensions, 673, 682.
  Charging on Local Funds, Objections to, 680, 682, 683, 692.
  Foreign Countries and British Colonies, Estimates from, 673, 674.
 Cottage Homes System, Working of, 685.
 Distinguishing between aged worker and tramp, necessity for, 690, 691.
 Foreign Countries and British Colonies, Systems in, 673, 674, 690.
 Former attempts at Legislation, 669, 672.
 Government Pledges, 689, 696, 697.
 Government Responsibility, 674, 678, 681, 682.

Aged Pensioners Bill—*cont.*
Debate on Second Reading—cont.
 Immediate Grant of Pension on proof of title to, 671.
 Poor Law Officials to administer the Act, 670, 677, 690, 698.
 State Officials, Amount of Old-age Pensions granted to, 672, 679.
 Title to Pension, Proof of, 670, 678.
 Workhouses.
  Association of the respectable poor with undesirable persons, 675, 676.
  Classification of Inmates and provision of separate accommodation for Imbeciles, etc., 676, 685, 695, 696.
  Dread of, among the poorer class, 675, 691.

Agg-Gardner, Mr. J. T. [Cheltenham]
Music, Teachers of—Delay as to Registration, *May 5*, 524.

Agrarian Outrages, Ireland
Discontinuing Returns.
 Q. Mr. Flynn; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 4*, 393.
Statistics as to.
 Os. Mr. Boland, *May 4*, 461, 462; Mr. W. Moore, 470; Col. Saunderson, 472.

Agriculture, Board of
President—Earl of Onslow.

Agriculture
Acreage of Wheat, Barley and Total Corn 1849–1853 and 1899–1903, in England, Scotland, and Ireland, with Produce and Average Price.
 Q. Mr. J. A. Pease; *A.* Mr. A. Fellowes, *May 9*, 742–744.
Ireland.
 Acreage of Wheat, Barley and Total Corn, 1849–1853 and 1899–1903.
  Q. Mr. J. A. Pease; *A.* Mr. A. Fellowes, *May 9*, 742.
 Statistical Return presented, *May 6*, 634, 643.
Railway Rates for Carriage of Produce, *see under* Railways.

Agricultural and Technical Instruction Department, Ireland
President—Mr. G. Wyndham.
Directory, Consulting local Technical Committees, as to.
 Q. Mr. Joyce; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 9*, 769.
Funds Disbursed—Total Amount up to Mar. 31, 1904—Proportion Paid in Salaries, etc.
 Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 9*, 747.

[*cont.*

Agricultural and Technical Instruction Department, Ireland—*cont.*
  Munster Dairy School, Allocation of Grant for.
    Q. Mr. Flynn; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 4*, 394.
  Provinces and Counties, Distribution of Funds among, and Contributions from.
    Q. Mr. W. Moore; *A.* Mr. Wyndham. *May 13*, 1297, 1298.
  St. Louis Exhibition, Exhibits at.
    Q. Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 4*, 388–389.
  Veterinary Branch.
    Clerks, Petition from, Asking for increment of Salary, Suppressed by Chief Clerks — Interpolation "Roman" in the Question, etc.
      Os. Mr. Delany, *May 16*, 1390, 1391, 1392; Mr. Speaker, 1391, 1392; Mr. J. Redmond, 1391.
    Compulsory Residence of Officers in Districts.
      Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 5*, 532.
    Officials Transferred from—Number, Names, Salaries, etc. — Return, proposed.
      Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 10*, 896.

Ainsworth, Mr. J. S. [Argyll]
  Congested Districts Board, Scotland, work of, *May 5*, 580.
  Crofters and Cottars, Scotland, Holdings for, *May 5*, 579, 580.
  Crofting Counties—Population, Decrease of—Select Committee of Inquiry, proposed, *May 11*, 1141.
  Deer Forests, Scotland, Acreage and Value of—Granting Return, *May 5*, 567.
  Tobacco Duties, Increase in—Budget Proposals, *May 3*, 318.
  Unclaimed Dividends on Government Stock, Appropriation of, to Pay off Budget Deficit, *May 3*, 365.

Alcohol
  Manufacturing Purposes, for, Freeing, from Payment of Duty, suggested.
    Q. Sir E. Flower; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *May 2*, 100–101.

Aldershot and Farnborough Light Railway Amendment Order, 1904
  Presented, *May 13*, 1272.

Alexandra (Newport and South Wales) Docks and Railway Bill
  l. Report from Select Committee, *May 5*, 493.
  Rep.* *May 10*, 865.
  3R.* *May 16*, 1358.

Aliens
  Poor Law, Relief other than Medical, Numbers in receipt of.
    Q. Mr. H. Samuel; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *May 4*, 385.
  Prisons, British, Numbers in.
    Q. Sir T. Dewar; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *April 29*, 14.

Aliens Bill
  Grand Committee, referring to.
    Qs. Mr. S. Buxton, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *May 3*, 269.

Allen, Mr. C. P. [Gloucestershire, Stroud.]
  Macedonian Gendarmerie, Re-organisation of—Authority of European Officers, *May 4*, 382.

Allotments, Scotland
  County and Parish Councils, proceedings of—Return presented, *May 16*, 1363.

Ambrose, Dr. R. [Mayo, W.]
  Emigration Statistics for Ireland, 1903—Statistics for Connaught — Holding Committee of Inquiry, *May 3*, 252.

Amersham, Beaconsfield and District Water Bill
  l. 2R.* *May 3*, 221.
    Rep.* *May 13*, 1270.

Anglo-French Agreement
  See France—Arbitration Treaty with Great Britain.

Animals
  Cattle, *see that title.*
  Dogs, *see that title.*
  Experiments on.
    Metropolitan Asylums Board, Application from, to register a place.
      Q. Dr. Shipman; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *May 5*, 523.
    Returns for 1903—Date of Publication —Number of Dogs Vivisected in University College, London.
      Q. Dr. Shipman; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *May 4*, 375.
    Scientific Results obtained during Past Year.
      Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *May 16*, 1382–1383.
    Smallpox virus, inoculation of dogs with.
      Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *May 10*, 893.
  Tuberculosis, *see that title.*

Ankylostomiasis
  Report on, presented, *May 4*, 371; *May 5*, 495.

Anson, Sir W. R.—*Parliamentary Secretary, Board of Education* [Oxford University]
  Compulsory Attendance, Limitation of, in case of Children between 5 and 7 living at a Distance, *May 3*, 242.

[*cont.*

Anson, Sir W. R.—*cont.*
- Education (Local Authority Default) Bill—extending operation to Secondary Schools, *May 4*, 377.
- Hayward's Heath, New School at—Date of publishing Report of Board of Inquiry, *May 3*, 242.
- Irish Language, including, as Optional Subject in the Code, *May 3*, 257–258.
- Local Authorities—Act of 1902, Names of Authorities neglecting to carry out, etc., *May 2*, 98.
- London County Council, Education Committee of — Exclusion of Public and Press from Meetings, *May 16*, 1384.
- Monmouthshire.
  - Appointed day in, *May 12*, 1155.
  - Population of each local area, *May 6*, 647.
- National Council, Scheme for—Joint Committee for Wales and Monmouthshire, etc., *May 5*, 539.
- Rate—Detention of Children during Playtime consequent on Parents' Refusal to pay, *May 11*, 1005.
- Religious Instruction.
  - Children attending after the Hour for, Detention of, during Play-time, *May 11*, 1005–1006.
  - Secondary Schools in, making Grant conditional on—Cases, *May 4*, 386.
- Teachers.
  - Election of, as Members of Education Authorities — proposed Government Action, *May 16*, 1383.
  - Music—Delay as to Registration, *May 5*, 524–525.
- Wales.
  - Carmarthen County Council, breach of Education Act by, Inquiry into—Date of Report, *May 2*, 118.
  - Education Grant, Appointment of, *May 2*, 117.
  - Nonconformist Children educated in Church Schools, Number of, *May 5*, 538.
  - Population of each Local Area, *May 6*, 647.

Arbitration
- France and Great Britain, between, *see under* France.

Argentina
- Trade Report presented, *May 9*, 703.

Arklow Harbour
- Improvement of—Circulation of Report of Board of Works Engineer.
  - *Qs.* Mr. J. O'Connor, Mr. J. Redmond; *As.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *May 2*, 124.

Armagh
- Workhouse—Master's Salary, Reason for raising, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. J. Campbell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 5*, 542.

Armaments
- Reduction of, by means of negotiations with Foreign Powers, proposed—References to, in debate on the Finance Bill, *May 16*, 1407, 1408, 1413, 1479.

Army
- *Secretary of State*—Mr. H. O. Arnold-Forster.
- *Under Secretary*—Earl of Donoughmore.
- *Financial Secretary* — Mr. W. Bromley-Davenport.
- Barrack Workshops at Island Bridge, closing of—Expenditure on imported Carts and Wagons, 1900-1903, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. Nannetti; *A.* Mr. B. Davenport, *May 9*, 754.
- Candidates' Examinations — Leaving and Qualifying Certificates — Preliminary Examination.
  - *Q.* Sir. C. Rasch; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *May 4*, 377–378.
- Chaplains, Scottish — Allowing Free Church a share of Appointments.
  - *Q.* Capt. Ellice; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *May 2*, 103.
- Churchill, Private J., Wrongful Arrest of—Question of Compensation.
  - *Q.* Sir T. Roe; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Apr. 29*, 13.
- Clonmany to Leenan Fort—Conveyance of Military Passengers—Accepting Local Contract, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *May 9*, 749.
- Clothing Factory, Engineers' Department—Regulations as to Sick Pay and Compensation for Accidents.
  - *Q.* Mr. Shackleton; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *May 11*, 1011–1012.
- Condition of, in 1895, etc.—References to, in Debate on the Finance Bill, *May 16*, 1413, 1418, 1419.
- Duke of York's School—Disposal of Site.
  - *Q.* Mr. Whitmore; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *May 12*, 1162.
- Expenditure on.
  - Increase in, necessity for reduction, etc.—References to, in Debate on the Finance Bill, *May 16*, 1403, 1404, 1408, 1414, 1421, 1424, 1427, 1431, 1440, 1445, 1449, 1455, 1456, 1461, 1462, 1465, 1471, 1472, 1478, 1483.
  - Works Acts, under, increase in—References to, in Debate on the Finance Bill, *May 16*, 1435, 1476.
- Foot Guards, New Overcoats for—Date of last Change of Uniform.
  - *Q.* Sir C. Rasch; *A.* Mr. B. Davenport, *May 9*, 755–756.

[*cont.*

Army—*cont.*
- Irish Guards.
  - Constabulary, Inducements offered to, to enlist.
    - *Q.* Mr. Macveagh ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 11*, 1019.
  - Reservists from—Admission to Royal Irish Constabulary.
    - *Qs.* Mr. Macveagh, Mr. J. Redmond ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 9*, 768.
- Irish Rifles, Royal, 5th Battalion—Train at Downpatrick.
  - *Q.* Mr. Wood ; *A.* Mr. B. Davenport, *May 12*, 1184.
- Island Bridge — Barrack workshops at, closing of—Expenditure on imported Carts and Wagons, 1900-1903.
  - *Q.* Mr. Nannetti ; *A.* Mr. B. Davenport, *May 9*, 754.
- Manœuvres—Essex Yeomanry, Employment of—Question of Pay.
  - *Q.* Sir C. Rasch ; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *May 3*, 244.
- Medical College—Progress of Building.
  - *Q.* Dr. Farquharson ; *A.* Mr. B. Davenport, *May 9*, 752.
- Militia, Volunteers and Yeomanry, *see those titles.*
- Nurses, Improvement in Pay of.
  - *Q.* Dr. Farquharson ; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *May 2*, 103.
- Officers' Uniforms—Foot Guards' Overcoats—Date of last Change of Uniform.
  - *Q.* Sir C. Rasch ; *A.* Mr. B. Davenport, *May 9*, 755–756.
- Rifles, New Pattern.
  - Bolt Action—strain on bolt, etc.
    - *Os.* Lord Tweedmouth, *May 13*, 1277 ; Earl of Donoughmore, 1284 ; Earl of Erroll, 1287.
  - Cost of.
    - *Os.* Lord Tweedmouth, *May 13*, 1273, 1281 ; Earl Stanhope, 1281, Earl of Donoughmore, 1282, 1285.
  - Increased Recoil, Steps to remedy.
    - *Q.* Mr. Hunt ; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *May 3*, 244.
  - Issue of—Time allowed for completion of re-armament of forces, etc.
    - *Os.* Lord Tweedmouth, *May 13*, 1273 ; Earl of Donoughmore, 1285.
  - Length of.
    - *Os.* Lord Tweedmouth, *May 13*, 1274 ; Earl of Donoughmore, 1283 ; Earl of Erroll, 1286.
  - Magazine — Flimsiness of structure, alleged.
    - *Os.* Lord Tweedmouth, *May 13*, 1279 ; Earl of Donoughmore, 1284.

Army—*cont.*
- Rifles, New Pattern—*cont.*
  - Orders for, details of.
    - *Os.* Lord Tweedmouth, *May 13*, 1273 ; Earl of Donoughmore, 1285.
  - Sights of
    - *Os.* Lord Tweedmouth, *May 13*, 1276 ; Earl of Donoughmore, 1284.
- Soldiers, Punishment of — Number in prisons and number whose sentences involve discharge from the Army.
  - *Q.* Mr. C. Hay ; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *May 10*, 894.
- Somaliland, *see that title.*
- Stores and Supplies.
  - Ether in Manufactured Goods — Allowing for Duty in Price paid, etc.
    - *Q.* Mr. E. Gray ; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *May 12*, 1158.
  - Irish Garrisons, for—Contract value of Saddlery, etc. supplied from Woolwich, 1900-1903, etc.
    - *Q* Mr. Nannetti ; *A.* Mr. B. Davenport, *May 9*, 754–755.
- Tibet Expedition, *see that title.*
- Uniforms.
  - Guards, Caps of—New Service Cap proposed.
    - *Q.* Sir C. Rasch ; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *May 2*, 105.
  - Officers of—Foot Guards' Overcoats—Date of last Change of Uniform.
    - *Q.* Sir C. Rasch ; *A.* Mr. B. Davenport, *May 9*, 755–756.
- Waltham Abbey Ordnance Factory, Poisoning of Fish in River Lee by Outflow from—Steps to be taken
  - *Q.* Col. Lockwood ; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *May 16*, 1374-1375.
- Works Acts, Expenditure under — References to, in debate on the Finance Bill, *May 16*, 1435, 1476.
- Works Department, Ireland—Employment of Civilian Engineers.
  - *Q.* Mr. Sullivan ; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *May 3*, 245.

Army Estimates
- Growth of, References to, in debate on Finance Bill, *May 16*, 1403, 1404, 1408, 1414, 1421, 1424, 1427, 1440.

Arnold-Forster, Mr. H. O.—*Secretary of State for War* [Belfast, W.]
- Candidates' Examinations — Leaving and Qualifying Certificates—Preliminary Examination, *May 4*, 377–378.
- Chaplains, Scottish—Allowing the Free Church a Share of Appointments, *May 2*, 103.
- Churchill, Private J., Wrongful Arrest of—Question of Compensation, *Apr. 29*, 13.

Arnold-Forster, Mr. H. O.—*cont.*

- Clonmany to Leenan Fort—Conveyance of Military Passengers — Accepting Local Contract, etc., *May 9*, 749.
- Clothing Factory, Engineers Department—Regulations as to Sick Pay and Compensation for Accidents, *May 11*, 1011-1012.
- Defence of the Empire—Expenditure under the Act for Military purposes from 1888-1896, *May 13*, 1296.
- Duke of York's School—Disposal of Site, *May 12*, 1162.
- Guards, Caps of—New Service Caps proposed, *May 2*, 105.
- Indian Army.
  - Batteries, New, for—Date of giving out orders to Private Firms, *May 3*, 243-244.
  - Drafts for—Landing in the Hot Season, *May 5*, 534.
- Lee, River—Poisoning of Fish in, by Outflow from Waltham Abbey Ordnance Factory, *May 16*, 1374.
- Manœuvres—Essex Yeomanry, Employment of—Question of Pay, *May 3*, 244.
- Militia—Norfolk Commission—Date of publishing Report, *Apr. 19*, 16; *May 4*, 381.
- Nurses, Improvement in Pay of, *May 2*, 103.
- Rifle, New Pattern — Increased Recoil, Steps to remedy, *May 3*, 244.
- Somaliland Campaign—Total Cost, including Estimate for 1904, *May 12*, 1162.
- South African War.
  - Food destroyed as unfit for use, liability of Contractors, &c., *May 2*, 104.
  - Yeomanry, Imperial, and Volunteers, Number of, during war, *May 2*, 105.
- Volunteers.
  - Artillery—New Guns for, number of batteries re-armed, &c., *May 10*, 888.
  - Courts of Inquiry.
    - Fusiliers, Royal, 1st Battalion, Court of Inquiry in—Taking evidence on oath, *May 13*, 1298.
    - Particulars as to Courts held 1903-4, *May 3*, 243.
  - Manchester 2nd Battalion, providing suitable Training Ground for, *May 3*, 245.
  - Norfolk Commission—Date of publishing Report, *Apr. 29*, 16; *May 4*, 381.
  - Retired Sergeants—Regulations as to wearing Uniform, *May 9*, 748.
  - South African War, number engaged in, *May 2*, 105.

Arnold-Forster, Mr. H. O.—*cont.*

- Waltham Abbey Ordnance Factory Outflow, Poisoning of Fish in River Lee by, *May 16*, 1374.
- Woolwich Arsenal—Workmen suspended —Payment of Bonuses, *May 5*, 534-535.
- Works Department, Ireland, Civilian Engineers, Employment of, *May 3*, 245.
- Yeomanry.
  - Drill—Current Instructions—Issuing Revised Drill Book, *May 2*, 102.
  - Essex Regiment, Employment of, in Army Manœuvres—Question of Pay, *May 3*, 244.
  - South African War, number engaged in, *May 2*, 105.

Arsenical Poisoning

- Recommendations of Royal Commission, Adoption of Fixing Standard of Purity of Beer, etc.,
  - *Q.* Sir C. Quilter; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *May 11*, 1009.

Ascension Day

- Committees not to sit until two of the Clock.
  - *Motion* [Mr. A. J. Balfour], *May 11*, 1030.

Asher, Mr. A. [Elgin Burghs]

- Whale-hunting off the Scottish coast, Injury caused by, to Herring fisheries, etc., *May 5*, 563, 564.

Ashton, Mr. T. G. [Bedfordshire, Luton]

- Licensed Premises—Valuation for Estate Duty, *May 2*, 110, 111.
- Licensing Bill, 2R., *May 10*, 956.
  - Value of licensed premises, ascertaining *May 2*, 114.

Asquith, Rt. Hon. H. H. [Fife, E.]

- Licensing Bill, 2R., *May 11*, 1072, 1085, 1086.

Athanasian Creed

- Changes made by Convocation, introducing Bill to legalise, or to separate Church and State.
  - *Q.* Mr. Labouchere; *A.* Sir R. Finlay, *May 11*, 1008.

Atherley-Jones, Mr. L. [Durham, N.W.]

- Licensing Bill, 2R., *May 9*, 832.
- London County Council Education Committee, Exclusion of Press and public from meetings of, *May 16*, 1384.

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. J.—*Attorney-General for Ireland* [Londonderry, N.]

- Boycotting, Cruelty and Meanness of, *Apr. 29*, 48, 49.
- Crimes (Ireland) Act, 1887.
  - Classes of Crimes dealt with under, *Apr. 29*, 48-50.

[*cont.*

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. J.—*cont.*
  Crimes (Ireland) Act, 1887—*cont.*
    Occasions on which the Act has been put into force, *Apr. 29*, 50, 51, 52.
  Land Purchase—Encumbered Estates—Procedure for Inspection, &c., under Act, *May 2*, 120.
  Local Government (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill, 2R., *Apr. 29*, 44, 45.
  Longford, Abusive Soldier at, taking Action against, *May 4*, 387-388.
  Registration of Clubs (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *May 6*, 650, 655, 665.

Attorney-General—*Sir Robert B. Finlay.*

Attorney-General for Ireland—*Mr. J. Atkinson.*

Attorney-General
  Fees and Salaries of English and Irish.
    Q. Mr. Whitley ; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *May 5*, 522.

Aughris, Ireland
  Congested district, scheduling as, proposed—Facilities afforded for development of fishing industry.
    Q. Mr. W. McKillop ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 10*, 895.

Australia
  Immigration Regulations in.
    Q. Mr. Brigg ; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 4*, 380.
  New South Wales—Birth Rate, decline of—Tabling Committee Report.
    Q. Mr. D. A. Thomas ; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *Apr. 29*, 17.
  Penny Post to Great Britain, negotiations as to.
    Os. Lord Stanley, *May 12*, 1223 ; Mr. H. Heaton, 1225 ; Sir J. Leng, 1228 ; Mr. H. C. Richards, 1231.
  Victoria, Electoral Districts and Provinces Boundaries Acts, presented, *May 5*, 518 ; *May 6*, 634.

Avoch, Ross-shire
  Harbour, Government Grant for construction of.
    Qs. Mr. Weir ; *As.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *May 5*, 525 ; *May 10*, 894 ; *May 16*, 1364.

Avondale Estate, Wicklow
  Purchasers of.
    Q. Mr. J. O'Connor ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 4*, 391.

Bail Act
  Effect of—Bringing Provisions to Notice of Justices and their Clerks.
    Q. Mr. L. Morgan ; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *May 2*, 93-94.

Bailey Mr. J. [Newington, Walworth]
  Swaziland Mercantile Association, Customs Duties paid to Transvaal Government by, Repayment of, *May 12*, 1166.

Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Bill
  l. 1R.* *Apr. 29*, 3.
    2R.* *May 9*, 702.

Balcarres, Lord [Lancashire, Chorley]
  Charing Cross to the Mall, Road from—Date of completing, etc., *May 4*, 373.
  House of Commons—Vote Office, ventilation of, use of coal fire, etc., *May 2*, 117.
  Motor Cars—Speed in Hyde Park, *May 2*, 116.
  St. James Park.
    Removal of pathway at west end of Ornamental Water in, *May 10*, 887.
    Repairing paths, *May 16*, 1384.

Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J.—*First Lord of the Treasury* [Manchester, E.]
  Aliens Bill—Referring to Grand Committee, *May 3*, 269.
  Bishoprics of Southwark and Birmingham Bill, 2R., *May 4*, 397, 410, 447, 448.
  British Guiana—Indian Coolie Immigration Ordinance—Approval of Colonial and Indian Offices—Allowing Opportunity for Discussion, *May 12*, 1185-1186.
  Business of the House, Course of, *May 2*, 127, 128 ; *May 3*, 270 ; *May 4*, 397 ; *May 9*, 776 ; *May 12*, 1029, 1030.
  Cabinet, Re-election on accepting Office in, introducing Bill to remove Necessity of, etc., *May 3*, 267.
  Congested Districts Scotland Bill, Date of Introducing, *May 2*, 126.
  Cotton, Gambling in, Co-operating with Liverpool Exchange to prevent, *May 11*, 1027-1028.
  Cunard Money Committee, Arranging for Discussion on, *May 12*, 1186.
  Education (Local Authority Default) Bill, Proceeding with, *May 3*, 268.
  France—Arbitration Treaty with Great Britain, Date of Discussion on, *May 3*, 266.
  Highland Crofting Counties, Certification of deaths in—Introduction of Legislation, *May 16*, 1398.
  House of Commons—Standing Orders.
    Order in the House, Date of resuming Discussion on, *May 3*, 268.
    Private Members' Bills, Amending Order relating to, *May 3*, 265.
    Sittings of the House, Amending Order relating to, *May 3*, 269-270.
  Licensing Bill, 2R. *May 11*, 1034, 1082, 1087.

[*cont.*

Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J.—*cont.*
- Licensing Bill—*cont.*
  - Compensation, Time Limit for claiming—Inserting Amending Clause, *May 11*, 1028.
  - Extending Provisions to other Parts of United Kingdom, *May 9*, 775.
  - Licensed Houses, Returns relative to, Date of tabling, *May 3*, 268.
- Liquor Licensing, etc.
  - Intoxicating Liquors (Licensing) Bill, 1871, reprinting of, proposed, *May 2*, 126.
  - Licensed Premises — Ground Landlords of London, Number of Houses closed by—Notice given, etc., *May 9*, 776.
- Navy—Prizes of War, introducing Bill consolidating Acts relating to, *May 3*, 266.
- Parliamentary Elections—Absentee Electors, arranging to record Votes of, *May 9*, 775–776.
- Port of London Bill, Date and hour of resuming debate on, *May 4*, 396–397; *May 12*, 1029.
- Ritualistic Practices, Royal Commission on—Terms of Reference, *May 3*, 265.
- Sale of Butter Bill, proceeding with—Date of Second Reading, *May 4*, 396.
- Salisbury, Marquess of, erection of statue of, proposed, *May 2*, 126.
- Tobacco, Unstemmed — Importation in Anticipation of Budget Proposals—Appointing Select Committee, etc., *May 5*, 546, 547.
- Trades Union and Trades Disputes Bill, facilitating Passage of, *May 5*, 548, 549.
- Transvaal, Importation of Chinese Labour to—Transvaal Opinion.
  - Ascertaining by vote, *May 5*, 549.
  - Chamberlain, Mr. J., Pledge of, to consider, etc., adhering to, *May 3*, 263-265.
- Tuberculosis in Animals—Compensation to Farmers, appointment of Select Committee, etc., *May 16*, 1398.

Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W.—*President of the Board of Trade* [Leeds, Central]
- Census, 1901—Occupations in Scotland and Ireland, Figures of—Granting Summary, *May 11*, 1009.
- Ireland.
  - Baltimore Harbour Beacon, condition of, *May 2*, 125.
  - Cullooney, Railway Tickets not issued for, from Sligo, alleged, *May 2*, 125.
  - Great Northern Railway, lack of Sanitary Accommodation on trains, *May 16*, 1395.

Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W.—*cont.*
- Lights and Lighthouses.
  - Expenditure and Dues collected during year ended *Mar. 31*, 1904, *May 10* 886.
  - Lightship Keepers, Certificates of—Instructions in the event of Drifting, etc., *May 10*, 887.
- Merchant Shipping, Committee Recommendations, steps to carry out, *May 9*, 744-745.
- Merchant Shipping (Lighthouses) Bill, 2R., *May 13*, 1304, 1312, 1318, 1333.
- Patents, British, Compulsory Licences for—Total Number, etc., *May 3*, 241.
- Piers and Harbours.
  - Avoch Harbour Works, Grant in aid of, *May 10*, 894.
  - Baltimore Harbour, Condition of Beacon, *May 2*, 125.
  - Devonshire and Cornwall, Harbours of Refuge in, Utility of—Capt. Frederick's Report, *May 5*, 521.
- Railways.
  - Bideford, Westward Ho and Appledore—Loop on Quay Road, Bideford, refusing to sanction, *May 13*, 1295.
  - Buncrana and Carndonagh, Appointment of Arbitrators, *Apr. 29*, 15.
  - Cullooney, tickets not issued for, from Sligo, alleged, *May 2*, 125.
  - Fog Signals—Adopting Mechanical Apparatus, *May 12*, 1155–1156.
  - Great Northern, Ireland—Lack of sanitary accommodation on trains, *May 16*, 1395.
- Scotland—Avoch Harbour Works, Grant in aid of, *May 10*, 894.

Ballaghamechan
- Congested Districts Board, Failure of, to accede to application from, alleged.
  - *Q.* Mr. P. A. McHugh; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 10*, 897.

Ballinasloe
- Lunatic Asylum—Appointment of Dr. Kirwan—Confirmation of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 9*, 772–773.
  - Delay in sanctioning.
    - *Q.* Mr. Roche; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 5*, 531.
    - *Q.* Col. Nolan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 6*, 647–648.
    - *Qs.* Mr. Roche, Mr. Sloan; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 16*, 1386-1387.
- Petty Sessions—Turf Thefts from Kellysgrove Bog, Excessive Sentence for, advising Remission of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Roche; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 12*, 1177.

Ballyboy Farm

Artillery, Royal, Right of, to exercise—Interference with Settlement of Evicted Tenants.
Q. Mr. Cullinan ; *A.* Mr. B. Davenport, *May 9*, 753-754.

Ballymahon

Magisterial Bench, appointing Roman Catholic to Vacancy on.
Q. Mr. J. P. Farrell ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 3*, 255-256.

Ballymena

Telephone Extension, Cause of Delay in commencing Works.
Q. Mr. O'Doherty ; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Apr. 29*, 14-15.

Urban County District, Order respecting, presented, *May 6*, 635 ; 643.

Ballyvarley, Co. Down

Sunday Hurling Matches, Disturbances with regard to—Instituting Prosecutions.
Q. Mr. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 9*, 768-769.

Baltimore

Harbour—condition of Beacon.
Q Mr. Gilhooly ; *A.* Mr. G Balfour, *May 2*, 125.

Postal Service—Affording Second Post.
Q. Mr. Gilhooly ; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 3*, 262-263.

Banbridge, Co. Down

Disturbances at—Prosecution of Rioters, etc.
Q. Mr. Macveagh ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 9*, 773.
Qs. Mr. Macveagh, Mr. J. Redmond, Mr. T. W. Russell, Mr. S. O. Gore, Mr. Sloan ; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 11*, 1019-1021.
Q. Mr. Sloan ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May. 16*, 1392-1393.

Banbury, Sir F. G. [Camberwell, Peckham]

Finance Bill, 2R., *May 16*, 1470.

Financial Policy of the Government—Increase in Expenditure and Taxation, &c., *May 16*, 1470-1473.

Local Authorities—Methods of conducting business, etc., *April 29*, 38.

Local Government (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill, 2R., *April 29*, 38.

Milwr & District Mines Drainage Bill, Instruc. to Com., *May 12*, 1243.

Whiskey, taxation of, *May 3*, 344.

Bangor (Ireland)

Urban County District, Order respecting, presented, *May 6*, 635, 643.

Banks

Ireland, Bank of.

Government Moneys passing through, Tabling Terms of Arrangement as to.
Q. Mr. W. Abraham ; *A.* Mr. Chamberlain, *May 5*, 544-545.

Balance, Approximate daily, of Money on which no Interest is allowed, etc.
Q. Mr. J. Redmond ; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *May 9*, 774.

Terms of Arrangement as to,
Qs. Mr. W. Abraham, Capt. Donelan ; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *May 12*, 1157-1158.

Land Purchase Act 1903, Monopoly of Business connected with—Protests from Joint Stock Banks—Placing all Banks on same Footing, etc.
Q. Mr. W. Moore ; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *May 9*, 746-747.

Loan to Government during South African War—Interest charged, etc.—Appointing Committee of Inquiry.
Q. Mr. J. Redmond ; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *May 16*, 1396-1397.

Receivable Order under Land Purchase Act 1903—Form propo ed.
Q. Sir T. Esmonde ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 11*, 1011.

Barbados

Prison Rules, Amended, presented, *May 2*, 76, 89.

Barnard Castle Gas Bill

c. 2R.* *May 9*, 736.

Barnet District Gas & Water Bill

*c. Con.** *Apr. 29*, 10.
3R.* *May 3*, 236.
l. 1R.* *May 5*, 494.

Baronetcies

Wrongful Assumption of, Alleged—Proposal of Standing Council to appoint Commission of Inquiry.
Q. Sir J. Dorington ; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *May 16*, 1365.

Barracks

Island Bridge Workshop, Closing of—Expenditure on imported Carts and Wagons, 1900-1903, etc.
Q. Mr. Nannetti ; *A.* Mr. B. Davenport, *May 9*, 754.

Barrow, River

Inspection of
Q. Mr. Delany ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 13*, 1297.

Barry, Mr. E. [Cork Co., S.]
Dunmanway Electoral Division—Dividing into two Divisions, *May 5*, 532.

Barry Railway (Extension of Time) Bill
c. 3R* *May 2*, 86.

Bartley, Sir G. C. T. [Islington, N.]
Civil Service Estimates, Increase in, *May 16*, 1450-54.
Finance Bill, 2R., *May 16*, 1450.
Financial Policy of the Government—Increase in Expenditure and Taxation, &c., *May 16*, 1450-1456.

Barvas (Island of Lewis)
Destitution consequent on failure of crops—Relief works proposed.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *May 2*, 119.

Bathurst, Mr. A. B. Gloucestershire, Cirencester]
House of Commons—Standing Order (Order in the House)—Date of resuming Discussion on, *May 3*, 267-268.

Bayley, Mr. T. [Derbyshire, Chesterfield]
Liquor Licences, Compensation for withdrawal of—Brewery Servants holding Licences, granting to, *May 3*, 239-240.
Post Office—
Insanitary Condition of Offices, *May 12*, 1170, 1257.
Wages of Officials, Report of Committee of Inquiry into—Facilities for discussion, *May 12*, 1218.
Transvaal, Importation of Chinese Labour to—Resolution of Cape Colony Legislative Assembly against, *May 11*, 1015.

Beach, Rt. Hon. Sir M. H. [Bristol, W.]
Aged Pensioners Bill, 2R., *May 6*, 699.
Merchant Shipping (Lighthouses) Bill, 2R., *May 13*, 1336.
Salisbury, Marquess of, proposed erection of Statue of, *May 2*, 126.

Beckett, Mr. E. W. [Yorkshire, N.R., Whitby]
Finance Bill, 2R., *May 16*, 1441.
Financial Policy of the Government—Increase in Expenditure and Taxation, etc., *May 16*, 1441-1446.

Beer.
Arsenical Poisoning of—Adopting Recommendations of Royal Commission—Fixing Standard of Purity, etc.
Q. Sir C. Quilter; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *May 11*, 1009.
Excise Duties on.
Continuance of—Resolution, *May 3*, 323, 341.
Os. Mr. Flynn, *May 3*, 341; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 348-50.

Beer—*cont.*
Excise Duties on—*cont.*
Higher Tax on Beer sold in tied houses, proposed,
Os. Mr. Broadhurst, *May 3*, 333; Mr. Labouchere, Mr. Whitby, 335; Mr. C. Grant; Mr. C. Warner, 336.

Belcoo
Constabulary Force, Discharging duties of neighbouring stations, etc.
Q. Mr. Jordan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 16*, 1390.

Belhaven and Stenton, Lord.
Weights and Measures (metric system) Bill, Rep., *May 16*, 1359.

Bell, Mr. R. [Derby]
Transvaal—Natives in Mines, treatment of, *May 5*, 624-27.

Belmore, Earl
Peers, Roll of, Presentation of, at beginning of each Session, proposed, *May 13*, 1287-1288.

Belper, Lord.
Street Betting Bill, 2R., *May 3*, 229. *Com. May 10*, 867, 869, 870, 871, 872, 875.

Belturbet.
Post Office—New Building, Local Objection to—Reconsidering Plans.
Q. Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 3*, 262.

Bhownaggree, Sir. M. M. [Bethnal Green, N.E.]
South African War—Natal Volunteer Ambulance Corps, granting Queen's Medals to, *May 19*, 753.

Bideford, Westward Ho and Appledore Railway
Loop on Quay Road, Bideford, refusing to sanction.
Q. Mr. Soares; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *May 13*, 1295.

Bills of Exchange Act, 1882, Amendment Bill.
l. 2R., *May 9*, 735. *Com.* May 13*, 1273.

Birds.
Wild—Protection of—Publishing clearer Notices under Act.
Q. Mr. Pirie; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *May 13*, 1294.

Birmingham
Bishopric of, *see* Bishoprics of Birmingham and Southwark Bill.

Bishoprics of Southwark and Birmingham Bill
c. 2R. *May 4*, 397.
Rep.* *May 16*, 1399.
Debate on Second Reading [Commons], *May 4*, 397.

[*cont.*

Bishoprics of Southwark and Birmingham Bill—*cont.*
Debate on Second Reading—cont.
Bishops' Veto, Failure to Exercise, 406, 413.
Diocesan System, Subdividing, proposed, 398, 403.
Disestablishment of the Church proposed, 408, 412, 418, 424, 432–436.
Endowment to be provided by Private Subscription, 400, 404, 416, 421, 425, 433.
Precedents for, 398.
"Protestant" — Meaning of Word, 410.
Referring Bill to Standing Committee on Law, proposed, 445–452.
Relations between Church and State, 417, 419, 420, 431, 434–438.
Resolutions in favour of, 399, 400.
Ritualistic Practices.
"Children's Eucharist," Illegality of, 404, 405, 411.
Commission on — Delaying Bill until issue of Report of, 412, 419.
Guarantees that New Dioceses would be administered according to the Law, 403, 404, 406, 418.
Illegality of, 412, 413, 420, 424, 430.
Instances of, 404, 408, 409.
Oxford Movement the origin of, alleged, 409, 410.
Rochester, Diocese of, large area covered by, and proposed Subdivision of, 399, 427, 430, 433.
Supervision of the clergy by the Bishops, laxity of, 400, 401, 404, 406, 408, 426, 428, 429.
Worcester, diocese of, large area covered by, and proposed subdivision of, 398, 399, 416, 422, 432, 435.

Bishops Stortford and District Gas Bill
l. Rep.* *May 3*, 221.
3R.* *May 6*, 633.

Black, Mr. A. W. [Banffshire]
Education [Scotland] Bill, 2R., *May 2*, 128.
Licensed Premises—Valuation for Estate Duty—Scotch Methods, etc., *May 9*, 759–760.

Blake Mr. E.—*Temporary Chairman of Committees* [Longford, S.]
Local Government (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill, 2R., *Apr. 29*, 31.

Bloomfield Estate
Sale of, Name of owner, &c.
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 2*, 121.

Blyth and Cowpen Gas Bill
l. Rep.* *May 3*, 221.
3R.* *May 13*, 1270.

Board of Agriculture
see Agriculture, Board of.

Board of Education
see Education, Board of.

Board of Trade
see Trade, Board of.

Boland, Mr. J. [Kerry, S.]
Cahirciveen River, Authority responsible for placing Buoys and Perches in Estuary of, *May 16*, 1384–1385.
Cooscroum Landing Place—Date of commencing Work, *May 5*, 540.
Crimes Act, Ireland, Administration of, *May 4*, 461–3.
Education.
Building Plans, Decision as to, *May 12*, 1176.
Training Colleges.
Free Homes for—Resolution of Roman Catholic Bishops, *May 3*, 253.
Marlborough Street Training College — Granting Return dealing with Students, *May 6*, 647.
Fishermen's Insurance Scheme, Delay in putting into operation, *May 5*, 539-540.
Irish Language.
Dictionary of — Progress of Work—Expenditure, *May 3*, 258.
Educational Code, including as Optional Subject in, *May 3*, 257–258.
Post Office Officials, Knowledge of Irish required of, *May 3*, 260-261.
Law and Justice, Ireland, Administration of, *May 4*, 460–461.
Valentia Harbour, Telegraph Office at, continuing, during the Fishery Season, *May 12*, 1183.

Borough Councils
Indebtedness of—Date of presenting Return of.
Q. Mr. J. Ellis; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *May 11*, 1008.

Borrisoleigh, N. Tipperary
Band, Securing, from Police Interference—Relieving District from Burden of Extra Police, etc.
Q. Mr. P. J. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 16*, 1394-1395.

Boscawen, Capt. A. S. T. G. [Kent, Tonbridge.]
Bishoprics of Southwark and Birmingham Bill, 2R., *May 4*, 426.
India-Rubber Cultivation by Government in Burma and other places—Discontinuing Experiments, *May 5*, 529.

Boscawen, Capt. A. S. T. G.—*cont.*
  Ley's Charity—Representation of Parish of Combe Martin, *May 5*, 522.
  Tunbridge Wells, National Telephone Company's Charges at, *May 5*, 520–521.

Bournemouth Corporation (Tramways) Bill
  l. Rep.* *May 5*, 493.
    3R.* *May 16*, 1358.

Bowles, Mr. T. G. [Lynn Regis]
  Bishoprics of Southwark and Birmingham Bill, 2R., *May 4*, 449.
  Business of the House, Course of, *May 2*, 128.
  Cunard Money Committee, arranging for Discussion on, *May 12*, 1186.
  Lunacy — Institutions for Treatment of Incipient Cases, Establishment of, proposed, *May 12*, 1203.
  Merchant Shipping (Lighthouses) Bill, 2R., *May 13*, 1311.
  Navy — Prizes of War, Introducing Bill consolidating Acts relating to, *May 3*, 266.
  Newchwang, Steps to Safeguard British Life and Property at, *May 11*, 1016.
  Port of London Bill.
    Date and hour of resuming Debate on, *May 12*, 1029.
    Proceedings on, Resumption of—*Motion* [Mr. G. Balfour], *May 4*, 396.
    "Special Standing Order for the Session, 1904," character and duration of, *May 9*, 777, 778.
  Taxation—Cost per cent. of Collection under the different Heads of Revenue, *May 11*, 1010.
  Tibet Expedition—Advance to Lhasa.
    Government Sanction, *May 12*, 1167.
    Negotiations, Period allowed for, *May 16*, 1379.
  Unclaimed dividends on Government Stock, Appropriating, to pay off Budget Deficit, *May 3*, 360.

Boycotting, Ireland
  County Councils in the South and West of Ireland under the influence of priestly tyranny, alleged.
    O. Mr. T. L. Corbett, *Apr. 29*, 37.
  Cruelty and meanness of.
    O. Mr. Atkinson, *Apr. 29*, 48, 49.

Brassey, Lord
  Merchant Shipping—Seamen, percentage of British, Foreign, and Lascar, etc., employed, *May 9*, 732, 733.
  Merchant Shipping Bill, 2R., *May 9*, 732.
  Navy—Royal Reserve, Increase in Number of, proposed, *May 9*, 733.

Brigg, Mr. J. [Yorkshire, W.R., Keighley]
  Aged Pensioners' Bill, 2R., *May 6*. 677.
  Education (Local Authority Default) Bill—Extending Operation to Secondary Schools, *May 4*, 377.
  Immigration Regulations in British Colonies, *May 4*, 380.
  Lunacy.
    Commissioners, conflicting instructions given by, *May 12*, 1201, 1202.
    Differentiation in treatment and accommodation for curables, incurables, and children, proposed, *May 12*, 1201.
    Inquiry into whole question of, proposed, *May 12*, 1201, 1202.
    London County Council, work of, in providing institutions, *May 12*, 1200.
  Motor Cars, Registration Marks on, *May 4*, 375.
  Public Loans Act—Local Loans issued—Total Amount—Amount to be remitted 1904, *May 4*, 376.

Brighton
  Telephone Service between London and—Arranging for more efficient service.
    Q. Mr. Loder; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 16*, 1367–1368.

Bristol Corporation Bill
  l. Report from Select Committee, *May 13*, 1270.

British Guiana
  Indian Coolie Immigration Ordinance—Approval of Colonial and Indian Offices, etc.—Albert Hall speech on—Allowing opportunity for discussion.
    Q. Sir H. Fowler; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *May 12*, 1184–1186.

Brixham Gas Bill
  l. Rep.* *May 10*, 865.

Broadhurst, Mr. H. [Leicester]
  Beer, excise duties on—Higher tax on beer sold in tied houses, proposed, *May 3*, 333.

Brodrick, Right Hon. St. John F.—*Secretary of State for India.* [Surrey, Guildford].
  Army, Indian, Organisation of—Tabling Memorandum of Lord Kitchener, *May 16*, 1372.
  Competitive Examinations for Public Services, Abolition of, Information as to, *May 5*, 535.
  Coolie Labour, Export of Indentured—Practice stopped by Government since 1870—Granting Return, *May 5*, 529.
  Police Service Committee recommendations, estimated annual cost of adoption, *May 16*, 1372.

[*cont.*

Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John—*cont.*
- Rubber Cultivation by Government in Burma and other places—Discontinuing Experiments, *May 5*, 529–530.
- Seistan Boundary Commission—Estimated Cost of Work—Defraying Cost, etc., *May 3*, 247.
- Tibet Expedition.
  - Chinese Amban and Tibetan Representative, Authority of, *May 4*, 382.
  - Expenditure incurred — Estimated Cost of Advance to Lhasa—Troops to be employed, *May 13*, 1296–1297.
  - Lhasa, Advance to.
    - Date of — Location of Chinese Amban—Character of Chinese Suzerainty, etc., *May 16*, 1380.
    - Explanation of—Chinese Sanction to Expedition — Guarding Lines of Communication, etc., *May 12*, 1167–1169.
    - Sanction of, Delaying, until Arrival of Chinese Amban, *May 16*, 1378-1379.
  - Recognition of, by Dalai Lama, etc., *May 2*, 109.
  - Strength, Arms, etc., *May 16*, 1379.

Brunner, Sir J. T. [Cheshire, Northwich]
- Unclaimed Dividends on Government Stock, Appropriating, to pay off Budget deficit, *May 3*, 357, 363.

Bryce, Rt. Hon. J. [Aderdeen, S.]
- Education [Scotland] Bill, 2R., *May 2*, 177.
- Smoke Nuisance, Foreign Legislation as to—Tabling Reports proposed, *May 16*, 1380.
- Tibet Expedition—Communications with Russia since Nov. 17, 1903—Tabling Papers, *May 11*, 1015.

Brymbo Water Bill
- c. Rep*. *May 6*, 641.
  - *Con.** *May 13*, 1290.

Buchanan, Mr. T. R. [Perthshire, E.]
- Africa, East, Steamship Service, proposed Subsidy to—Contribution from India, *May 2*, 112.
- Business of the House, Course of, *May 2*, 127.
- Finance Bill, 2R., *May 16*, 1473.
- Financial Policy of the Government—Increase in Expenditure and Taxation, etc., *May 16*, 1473–1479.
- National Debt—Annual Return, Date of Publication of, *May 4*, 377.
- Railway Rates on Agricultural Produce—High Charges in Scotland—Reply from Railway Companies to Agricultural Board, *May 16*, 1370.

Buchanan, Mr. T. R.—*cont.*
- Transvaal, Importation of Chinese Labour to—Plague at Hong-Kong—Cancelling Charters of Steamers, *May 9*, 757.

Budapest
- Lottery Drawings at—Postage of Circulars in London by English Agent—Instituting Inquiries.
  - *Q.* Sir T. Dewar; *A.* Earl Percy, *May 9*, 744.

Budget
- Beer, Spirits, etc.—Continuance of Taxes on, *May 3*, 323, 341.
- Debates, *May 3*, 275
  - (*for details, see titles* Tobacco, Beer, Spirits, *etc.*)
- Tobacco Duty.
  - Cigars and Cigarettes, foreign, *May 3*, 275 (*for details of debate, see* Tobacco).
  - Stripped Tobacco, *May 3*, 275 (*for* details of debate, *see* Tobacco).
- Unclaimed dividends, appropriation of, to pay off Deficit.
  - *Os.* Mr. Dalziel, Mr. Whitley, *May 3*, 355.

Bulls
- Galloway, Purchase of, in Ireland under Agricultural Department's Live Stock Schemes.
  - *Q.* Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 4*, 390–391.

Buncrana
- Railway to Carndonagh—Appointment of Arbitrators.
  - *Q.* Mr. O'Doherty; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Apr. 29*, 15.

Burial Service
- Refusal to read by Vicar of Little Canfield, Essex—Taking Steps to prevent recurrence of Incident.
  - *Q.* Mr. J. A. Pease; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *May 16*, 1364–1365.

Burke, Mr. E. H. [King's Co., Tullamore]
- Crimes Act, Ireland, Administration of, *May 4*, 463–67.
- Members of Parliament, Payment of, proposed, *May 11*, 1121–23.

Burt, Mr. T. [Morpeth]
- Licensing Bill, 2R., *May 9*, 778.

Business of the House
- Course of—Mr. A. J. Balfour's replies to questions and criticisms, *May 2*, 127, 128; *May 3*, 270; *May 4*, 397; *May 9*, 776; *May 12*, 1029, 1030.
- Ways and Means, Proceedings on Reports of Committee—Suspension of Twelve o'clock Rule.
  - *Motion* [Mr. A. J. Balfour] *May 3*, 272.

Butcher, Mr. J. G. [York]
  Licensing Bill, 2r., *May 10*, 950, 951.

Butchers
  Paddington—Sanitary Inspector's Instructions regarding Pig Carcases.
    Q. Mr. Field ; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *May 4*, 384–385.

Butter
  Irish—Railway Rates to English Markets.
    Q. Mr. Joyce ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 9*, 765.

Buxton, Mr. S. C. [Tower Hamlets, Poplar]
  Aliens Bill—Referring to Grand Committee, *May 3*, 269.
  Tibet Expedition—Advance to Lhasa—Communicating with Chinese Government, *May 16*, 1380.
  Transvaal Labour Question.
    Chinese Labour, Importation of—Repatriation of Wives and Children.
      Cost of Regulations as to, *May 12*, 1163.
      Importers' Liability as to, *May 10*, 889.
    Gold Output of Mines, Statistics as to—Kaffirs employed, *May 4*, 378 ; *May 9*, 751.
    Mortality in Mines—Tabling Reports, etc., *May 11*, 1013, 1014.
    Native Labour in Mines—Numbers employed in 1903–1904, *May 12*, 1162.

Cabinet
  Re-election on accepting Office in, introducing Bill removing Necessity of.
    Qs. Mr. F. Ridley, Sir C. Dilke, Mr. W. Redmond ; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *May 3*, 266–267.

Cahirciveen River
  Buoys and Perches in the Estuary, Authority responsible for placing.
    Qs. Mr. Boland, Mr. Joyce, Mr. Flynn ; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, Mr. Speaker, *May 16*, 1384–1385.

Caldwell, Mr. J. [Lanarkshire, Mid]
  Foreign ships trading to ports in the United Kingdom, Applicability of Statutory requirements to, *May 4*, 459.
  Provisional Order [Marriages] Bill, 2r., *May 3*, 367.

Campbell, Mr. James H. M. [Dublin University]
  Registration of Clubs (Ireland) Bill, 2r., *May 6*, 660, 661.

Campbell-Bannerman, Rt. Hon. Sir H. [Stirling Burghs]
  Aliens Bill—Referring to Grand Committee, *May 3*, 269.

Campbell-Bannerman, Rt. Hon. Sir H. —*cont.*
  Business of the House, Course of, *May 2*, 127 ; *May 3*, 270 ; *May 4*, 397 ; *May 9*, 776 ; *May 10*, 1029, 1030.
  Crimes (Ireland) Act, Repeal of, proposed, *May 4*, 475.
  Finance Bill, 2r., *May 16*, 1400.
  Financial Policy of the Government—Increase in Expenditure and Taxation, etc., *May 16*, 1400–1412.
  Law and Justice, Ireland, Administration of, *May 4*, 475, 476.
  Licensing Bill, 2r., *May 10*, 915, 931.
    Licensed Houses, Returns relative to, Date of tabling, *May 3*, 268.
  Local Government (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill, 2r., *Apr. 29*, 51.
  Personal Accusations made in Question Time, Obligation to withdraw, *May 5*, 546–547.

Cambrian Railways Bill
  c. Rep.* *May 6*, 641.
    *Con.** *May 13*, 1290.

Cambridge University
  Statutes made by Governing Body presented, *Apr. 29*, 4, 11.

Canada
  Cattle from, Importation of—Removing Restrictions.
    Q. Capt. Ellice ; *A.* Mr. A. Fellowes, *May 4*, 385–386.
  Immigrants into, 1902–3, Numbers and Nationality of.
    Q. Mr. D. A. Thomas ; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *Apr. 29*, 17.
  Immigration Regulations in.
    Q. Mr. Brigg ; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 4*, 380.
  Newspapers, etc., from the United Kingdom, facilitating introduction of.
    Os. Sir J. Leng, *May 12*, 1228 ; Mr. H. C. Richards, 1231 ; Mr. Slack, 1266.
  "Scotia," Services rendered to—Recovery of salvage claims against Vessels owned by the Crown.
    Os. Lord Muskerry, *Apr. 29*, 5 ; Duke of Marlborough 7.

Canal Rates and Charges (Regent's Canal) Order Confirmation Bill
  l. 1r.* *May 3*, 222.

Canals
  Railway and Canal Commission, Annual Report of, presented, *May 9*, 703, 737.
  Regent's Canal and Dock Company, Rates and charges of, Report by Board of Trade presented, *May 12*, 1151 ; *May 13*, 1273.

Canterbury, Lord Archbishop of
Education [Transferred Schools] Bill, 1r., *May 9*, 717.
Street Betting Bill, 2r., *May 3*, 230.

Cape Colony
Legislative Assembly, Resolution by, against the Introduction of Chinese Labour—Terms—Date of adopting.
Qs. Mr. J. Ellis, Mr. Bayley; *As.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 11*, 1014–1015.

Cardiff Railway Bill
l. Report from Select Committee, *Apr. 29*, 2.
Rep.* *May 5*, 493.
3r.* *May 10*, 866.
c. 1r.* *May 13*, 1292.

Carlisle Corporation Bill
c. Rep.* *May 11*, 1001.

Carlow
Evicted Tenants in — Names of those making Applications for Restoration, etc.
Q. Mr. Hammond; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 12*, 1160.

Carloway.
Road to Stornoway, date of completion.
O. Mr. Weir, *May 5*, 565.

Carmarthen.
County Council's breach of Education Act, Inquiry into—Date of Report.
Q. Mr. A. Davies; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *May 2*, 117, 118.

Carndonagh.
Railway to Buncrana—Appointment of Arbitrators.
Q. Mr. O'Doherty; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Apr. 29*, 15.

Carrickfergus
Sewage Nuisance near, Steps to Remedy.
Q. Col. McCalmont; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 9*, 747.

Carrington, Earl of
Transvaal Labour Question—Treatment of Natives in Mines—Date of Issue of Blue-books, *May 10*, 876.

Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir E. H.—*Solicitor-General* [Dublin University]
Licensing Bill, 2r. *May 10*, 926.

Castletown, Berehaven
Postal Arrangements—Granting Improved Facilities.
Q. Mr. Gilhooley; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 5*, 519-520.

Cattle
Bulls, Galloway, Purchase of, in Ireland under Agricultural Department's Live Stock Schemes.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 4*, 390-391.

Cattle—*cont.*
Canadian, Importation of—Removing Restrictions.
Q. Capt. Ellice; *A.* Mr. A. Fellowes, *May 4*, 385-386.
Tubercular, Sale of, for Breeding Purposes—Suggested Restriction.
Q. Capt. Ellice; *A.* Mr. A. Fellowes, *May 4*, 386.

Causton, Mr. R. K. [Southwark, W.]
Vans, Covered, London County Council Bye-Law as to—Issuing Regulations to Police, Proceedings against Messrs. Carter Paterson & Co., &c., *May 16*, 1383.

Cavendish, Mr. V. C. W.—*Financial Secretary of the Treasury* [Derbyshire, W.]
Civil Service — Temporary Clerks — Arrangements as to Pensions, *May 2*, 93.
Customs and Excise — Warehouse Accounts, Transfer of, to a different Department, *May 5*, 523.
Finance Bill, 2r., *May 16*, 1412.
Financial Policy of the Government—Increase in Expenditure and Taxation, &c., *May 16*, 1412-1418.
Fisheries, North Sea—International Committee—Treasury Contribution towards Scottish Expenditure, etc., *May 5*, 538.
Historical Manuscripts, Welsh — Reports of Royal Commission, *May 5*, 538.
Income Tax Abatements—Total Amount liable to be paid — Particulars for latest available year, *May 12*, 1171–1172.
Ireland.
  Arklow Harbour, Improvement of—Report of Board of Works Engineer, Circulation of, &c., *May 2*, 124.
  Crofton, Hugh, Estate of—Stamped Receipts for Rent and Ejectment Costs, refusal of, alleged—Inquiry, &c., *May 2*, 123, 124.
  Dredging of Harbours on the South-East Coast—Providing Additional Dredgers, *May 12*, 1160.
  Dublin College of Science, Architect of — Dissatisfaction at Appointment of Englishman, etc., *May 6*, 395; *May 9*, 775; *May 12*, 1182, 1183.
  Irish Language, Dictionary of—Progress of Work — Expenditure, *May 3*, 258.
  Law Officers of the Crown—Fees and Salaries, *May 5*, 522.
  Local Loans—Rate of Interest—Reverting to Former Rate, *May 3*, 258–259.
  Works, Board of, Act Establishing, Money Spent by, etc., *Apr. 29*, 15.
[*cont.*

Cavendish, Mr. V. C. W.—*cont.*
- Law Officers of the Crown, English and Irish—Fees and Salaries, *May 5*, 522.
- Public Loans Act, Local Loans under—Total Amount—Amount to be Remitted, 1904, *May 4*, 376.

Cawdor, Earl
- Education [Transferred Schools] Bill, 1r., *May 9*, 714.

Cecil, Mr. E. [Aston Manor]
- Africa, East—Proposed Subsidy to Steamship Service—Committee of Inquiry—Constitution and Terms of Reference, *May 2*, 111.
- Mail Service, Eastern—Tabling Committee Report, *May 16*, 1381.

Cecil, Lord H. R. H. [Greenwich]
- Tobacco, Increased Duties on — Budget Proposals, *May 3*, 308–311.

Census
- Africa, South—Date of Return.
  - *Qs.* Maj. Seely; *As.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 2*, 107.
- Ireland — General Topographical Index, presented, *May 6*, 634, 643.

Census of 1901
- Occupations in Scotland and Ireland, Figures of—Granting Summary.
  - *Q.* Mr. Toulmin; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *May 11*, 1009.

"Centurion," H.M.S.
- Gun Sights, Defective Condition of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Yerburgh; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *May 2*, 95–97.

Chairman of Committees [Mr. J. W. Lowther]
- Irrelevant Matter, Introduction of, *May 5*, 556, 560, 561, 566, 585; *May 12*, 1258, 1259.
- Notice of Motion not Appearing on Order of the Day—Right of Member to raise Motion, *May 5*, 551.
- Post Office Officials, Report of Committee of Inquiry into Salaries of—Taking Discussion of, on Telegraphs Vote, *May 12*, 1218, 1219.

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. [Birmingham, W.]
- Bishoprics of Southwark and Birmingham Bill, 2r., *May 4*, 412.
- Ritualistic Practices, illegality of, *May 4*, 412.
- Tobacco Duty, increase in—Anticipations of the Budget—Allegations against the Tariff Commission, *May 3*, 296–298.

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. A.—*Chancellor of the Exchequer* [Worcestershire, E.]
- Africa, East—Steamship Service, Proposed subsidy to.
  - Committee of Inquiry—Constitution and Terms of Reference, *May 2*, 111.
  - India, Contribution from, *May 2*, 112.
- Alcohol for Manufacturing Purposes, importation of, duty free, proposed, *May 2*, 100–101.
- Bank of Ireland.
  - Government Moneys passing through.
    - Balance, approximate daily, of Money on which no Interest is allowed, etc., *May 9*, 774.
    - Terms of Arrangement as to, *May 5*, 544–545; *May 12*, 1158.
  - Land Purchase Act, 1903, Monopoly of Business connected with — Protests from Joint Stock Banks—Placing all Banks on same footing, etc., *May 9*, 746–747.
  - Loan to Government during South African War—Rate of Interest—Appointment of Committee of Inquiry, proposed, *May 16*, 1397.
- Beer, Spirits, etc., continuing Excise Duties on, *May 3*, 348–350.
- Chilian Warships, Purchase of—Date of Contract—Tabling Contract, *May 5*, 536.
- China—War Indemnity, Application of Instalments of, after paying Balance of private Claims, *May 16*, 1381.
- Coal Exports — Quantity exported at declared Values—Statistics January to March, 1903, *May 2*, 99.
- Dog Licences—Average Amount of Fines—Number of Persons Fined, etc., *May 10*, 891.
- Ether in manufactured Goods for Army Stores — Allowing for Duty in Price paid, etc., *May 12*, 1158.
- Finance Bill—Date of Second Reading, and facilities for discussion, *May 3*, 366.
- Florin, New, Design of—Name of Designer, etc., *May 9*, 760–761.
- Government Stock, Unclaimed Dividends on.
  - Appropriation of, to pay off Budget Deficit, *May 3*, 356, 357, 363.
  - Stockholders, Efforts made to trace, *May 10*, 890, 891.
- Income Tax.
  - Collection of—English and Scotch Systems, Difference between, *May 2*, 98.
  - Friendly Societies, unregistered—Rule as to recovery of deductions, *May 5*, 537; *May 10*, 892.
- Licensed Property, Valuation of, for Estate Duty—Method, etc., *May 2*, 100, 111; *May 3*, 248; *May 4*, 383; *May 5*, 528; *May 9*, 760.

[*cont.*

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. A.—*cont.*
  Local Government Board and Board of Trade—Duties, etc., Committee of Inquiry into—Date of Report, *May 2*, 112.
  Merchant Shipping (Lighthouses) Bill, 2R., *May 13*, 1344.
  National Debt.
    Annual Return—Date of Publication, *May 4*, 377.
    Reduction of, Estimate of Sum to be applied to, 1903-4—Sum actually applied, *May 2*, 99-100.
  Revenue derived from Customs and Excise Duties 1899-1900—Estimated Revenue 1904-5, etc., *May 5*, 526-527.
  Taxation.
    Collection, Cost per cent. of, under the different Heads of Revenue, *May 11*, 1010.
    Surveyors, Clerks to, establishing, as permanent Civil Servants, *May 16*, 1371.
    War taxes, continuance of, in time of peace, *May 3*, 349.
  Tea, Adulteration of—Excluding Imports of impure Tea, *May 2*, 101.
  Tobacco Duty—Budget Proposals.
    Anticipations of the Budget—Allegations against Mr. Gallaher, etc., *May 3*, 295, 296, 299, 302.
    Cigars and Cigarettes — Estimated Revenue from Additional Duty, *May 3*, 248-249.
    Cigars and Cigarettes, foreign—Effect of Duty on home manufactures, etc., *May 3*, 300, 301.
    Stripped leaf, *May 3*, 304-308.
      Drawback on, *May 2*, 113; *May 3*, 248-249.
  Transvaal—Guaranteed Loan, issuing Remainder of, *May 4*, 377.

Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster
  Rt. Hon. Sir. W. H. Walrond.

Chancellor of the Exchequer
  Mr. Austen Chamberlain.

Channing, Mr. F. A. [Northants, E.]
  Aged Pensioners Bill, 2R., *May 6*, 681.
  Tuberculosis in Animals — Compensation for Farmers—Appointment of Select Committee, etc., *May 16*, 1398.

Charing Cross to the Mall
  Road from—Date of Completion, etc.
    Q. Sir H. Fowler; *A.* Lord Balcarres, *May 4*, 373.

Charities
  Lancaster, County of—Inquiry.
    Return Presented, *May 12*, 1004.

Charities—*cont.*
  Ley's Charity—Representation of Parish of Combe Martin.
    Q. Mr. Soares; *A.* Mr. G. Boscawen, *May 5*, 521-522.

Chartered Company of South Africa
  Jameson Raid Claim against.
    Q. Mr. Pirie; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 3*, 245-246.

Chelsea
  Duke of York's Military School—Disposal of Site,
    Q. Mr. Whitmore; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *May 12*, 1162.

Chesterfield Corporation (Tramways and Improvements) Bill
  c. 2R.* *May 4*, 369.
    Rep.* *May 12*, 1146.

Chesterfield Gas and Water Board Bill
  l. 3R.* *May 3*, 221.
  c. 1R.* *May 5*, 517.
    2R.* *May 16*, 1361.

Chichester, Earl of
  Sat first in Parliament after the death of his brother, *May 16*, 1357.

Chief Secretary for Ireland
  Mr. G. Wyndham.

Children
  Lunatic, provision of separate accommodation for, proposed.
    O. Mr. Brigg, *May 12*, 1201.

Chile
  Battleships, sale of, *see under* Navy.

China
  Hong-Kong, *see that title.*
  Newchwang—British Life and Property, Steps to Safeguard—Request of British Consul for Despatch of Gunboat, etc.
    Q. Mr. C. McArthur, Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Earl Percy, *May 11*, 1015-1016.
  Railways of Pekin Syndicate—Negotiations with the Chinese Government.
    Q. Mr. Yerburgh; *A.* Earl Percy, *May 12*, 1157.
  Tibet Expedition, *see that title.*
  Trade Reports presented, *May 5*, 494, *May 9*, 703.
  War Indemnity—Application of Instalments after paying Balance of Private Claims.
    Q. Mr. McCrae; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *May 16*, 1381.

Chippenham Gas Bill.
  l. Report from Select Committee, *May 10*, 865.
    Rep.* *May 13*, 1270.

Apr. 29—*May* 16.

Churchill, Private J.
- Arrest, wrongful, of—Question of Compensation.
  - *Q.* Sir T. Roe; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Apr. 29*, 13.

Churchill, Mr. W. L. S. [Oldham]
- Finance Bill, 2R. *May 16*, 1479.
- Financial Policy of the Government—Increase in Expenditure and Taxation, etc., *May 16*, 1479-1489.
- Transvaal Labour Question.
  - Native Labour Supply Association, allegations against, *May 5*, 599, 600.
  - Natives in Mines, Treatment of, *May 5*, 595-606.

Church of England
- Athanasian Creed—Changes made by Convocation, Introducing Bill to Legalise, or to separate Church and State.
  - *Q.* Mr. Labouchere; *A.* Sir R. Finlay, *May 11*, 1008.
- Ritualistic Practices, *see that title.*

Church of England Temperance Society
- Circular sent to Members of Parliament, Introduction of King's name into—Alleged Breach of Privilege.
  - *Os.* Maj. Jameson, Mr. Speaker, *May 9*, 776, 777.

Cigars and Cigarettes
- *See under* Tobacco.

City of London (Central Criminal Court House) Bill
- *c.* 1R.* *May 5*, 515.
  - 2R.* *May 10*, 880.

Civil Service
- Clerks, Temporary—Pensions, Arrangements as to.
  - *Q.* Mr. Thornton; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *May 2*, 92-93.
- Superannuation.
  - Certificates granted through inadvertence, *May 4*, 372; *May 5*, 495.
  - Retired allowance granted, *May 6*, 635, 643.
  - Post Office Employees not benefited by Superannuation Act, provision for.
    - *O.* Lord Stanley, *May 12*, 1222.

Civil Service Estimates
- Class 5—Total Sum expended on Transvaal and Orange River Colonies, 1901-2, 1902-3,
  - *Q.* Mr. Rea; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 12*, 1158-1159.
- Increase in, References to, in debate on the Finance Bill, *May 16*, 1450-1454, 1456, 1463.

Civil Service Estimates—*cont.*
- Items of expenditure continually urged on Ministers by private Members, in contradiction of the general outcry as to extravagance, References to, in debate on the Finance Bill, *May 16*, 1414, 1415, 1419, 1428, 1429, 1448, 1451, 1455, 1471, 1490.
- Lunacy, Commissioners of, Salaries and Expenses of, Office of—£10,259, *Com. May 11*, 1187.
- Post Office, Salaries and Expenses, etc.—£6,400,618, *Com. May 12*, 1215, 1245.
- Scotland, Secretary for, Salaries and Expenses of Office—£10,495, *Com. May 5*, 551.

Clancy, Mr. J. J. [Dublin Co., N.]
- Meath Hospital—Medical Staff—Election to Vacancies, *May 6*, 644.

Clive, Capt. P. A. [Herefordshire, Ross]
- Education (Local Authority Default) Bill, Proceeding with, *May 3*, 268.

Clonbrock, Lord
- United Irish League, Resolution of, to compel sales by landlords before May rents become due, alleged, *May 10*, 877.

Clones
- Telegraph examination at—Appointment of unsuccessful candidate to post, reasons for.
  - *Q.* Mr. Sloan; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 16*, 1396.

Clonmany
- Conveyance of Military Passengers to Leenan Fort from—Accepting Local Contract, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *May 9*, 749.

Clubs
- Registration of Clubs (Ireland) Bill, *see that title.*

Clyde Valley Electrical Power Bill
- *l.* 3R.* *May 5*, 493.
- *c.* 1R.* *May 6*, 641.

Coal
- Exports—Quantity of declared Values—Statistics, January and March 31st, 1903.
  - *Q.* Mr. D. A. Thomas; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *May 2*, 98-99.
- Tax on, Remission of, Proposed, References to in debate on the Finance Bill, *May 16*, 1467-1470.

Coastguard Service
- Dwellings, Inspection of, under Health Acts.
  - *Qs.* Mr. C. Hay; *As.* Mr. Pretyman, *May 10*, 889, 890.

Cochrane Mr. T. H.—*Under Secretary, Home Office* [Ayrshire, N.]
Inebriate Homes—Detention Regulations, *May 2*, 113.

Liquor Licenses.
Renewals of—Number of Refusals, etc., *May 2*, 114.
Value of Licensed Premises, Ascertaining, *May 2*, 114, 115.

Lobsters, Boiling of, alive, in Restaurants, Alleged, *May 2*, 126.

Provisional Order (Marriages) Bill, 2R., *May 3*, 367.

Coercion Act, Ireland
See Crimes (Ireland) Act, 1887.

Cohen, Mr. B. L. [Islington, E.]
Licenses, Refusals to renew, Decisions of Licensing Justices reversed by Quarter Sessions, 1894-1903, *May 2*, 94.

Coinage and Currency
Florin, New—Errors in Design—Name of Designer, etc.
Q. Mr. E. Griffiths; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *May 9*, 760, 761.

Colclough Estate, Wexford
Sale of, to Tenants, Expediting.
Q. Mr. Ffrench; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 3*, 255.

Colomb, Sir J. C. R. [Great Yarmouth]
Germany—Naval Shipbuilding Programme of 1900, Adherence to, *May 16*, 1369

Colonies
For particular Colonies, see their names.
Crown Agents, *see that title.*
Postal Orders—Interchanging with the United Kingdom, Negotiations as to.
O. Lord Stanley, *May 12*, 1221.

Combe Martin
Ley's Charity, Representations to.
Q. Mr. Soares; *A.* Mr. G. Boscawen, *May 5*, 521-522.

Committees
House of Commons—Ascension Day—Committees not to sit until Two of the Clock.
Motion [Mr. A. J. Balfour], *May 11*, 1030.

House of Lords—Journal Committee—Report presented, *May 5*, 494.

Commons Regulation (Merrow) Provisional Order Bill
c. 2R.* *May 10*, 880.

Commons Regulation (Oxshott) Provisional Order Bill
c. 2R.* *May 10*, 880.

Congested Districts, Ireland
Aughris, scheduling, proposed—Facilities afforded for Development of Fishing Industry, etc.
Q. Mr. W. McKillop; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 10*, 895.

Scheduling Districts as, Refusal of Applications for.
Q. Dr. Thompson; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 2*, 101-102.

Congested Districts Board, Ireland
Applications for Establishment of Parish Committees — Ballaghamechan and Tullaghan, failure of Board to accede to applications from.
Q. Mr. P. A. McHugh; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 10*, 897.

Purchase of Estates by—Achonry Estate.
Q. Mr. O'Dowd; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 2*, 121-122.

Congested Districts Board, Scotland
Combination of Powers of the Board with those of the Crofters Commission, proposed.
O. Mr. M. Ferguson, *May 5*, 571.

Fisheries—Assistance to, proposed.
Os. Mr. J. Dewar, *May 5*, 574-78; Mr. Weir, 587.
Herring—Provision of Motor Power for the Fleet, proposed.
O. Mr. C. Wason, *May 5*, 552.

Holdings for Crofters, purchase of land for.
Os. Mr. J. Dewar, *May 5*, 572, 573; Mr. Ainsworth, 579; Mr. Weir, 583; Mr. A. G. Murray, 589, 590.

Road Construction in Orkney—Delays.
O. Mr. C. Wason, *May 5*, 553.

Seed, failure to distribute, among Cottars and Crofters.
Os. Mr. J. Dewar, *May 5*, 574; Mr. Leveson-Gower, 579.

Work of—Criticisms on Report, etc.—
Os. Mr. C. Wason, *May 5*, 552; Dr. Farquharson, 555; Mr. M. Ferguson, 570-71; Mr. J. Dewar, 572, 574-78; Mr. Ainsworth, 580; Mr. Weir, 582-584; Mr. A. G. Murray, 589, 590.

Congested Districts (Scotland) Bill
Date of introducing.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *May 2*, 126.

Congo Free State
Administration of—Communications to Signatories of Berlin Act—Replies received and date of tabling.
Q. Mr. C. Douglas; *A.* Earl Percy, *May 11*, 1016-1017.

Atrocities, Alleged—Letter from Belgian Consul-General at Liverpool, steps to be taken regarding.
Q. Mr. Emmott; *A.* Earl Percy, *May 9*, 759.

[*cont.*

Congo Free State—*cont.*
Jones, Silvanus, Sentence imposed on, steps to be taken with regard to.
Q. Mr. Emmott; *A.* Earl Percy, *May 5*, 758.

Connemara
Postal delays in.
O. Mr. O'Malley, *May 12*, 1266.

Constabulary, Royal Irish
Bands performing in Public, Interference with—Cases of Meetings disturbed.
Qs. Mr. Hayden, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Flavin; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 11*, 1018.
Qs. Mr. Macveagh, Mr. J. Redmond, Mr. T. W. Russell, Mr. S O. Gore, Mr. Sloan; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 11*, 1019-1021

Belcoo Force—Discharging Duties of Neighbouring Stations—Reducing Expenditure.
Q. Mr. Jordan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 16*, 1390.

Compensation for Injuries by the Police—Case of Mr. W. M'Gifford.
Q. Mr. S. Ormsby-Gore; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 5*, 530-531.

Discipline of, Newspaper Controversy regarding, Right of Magistrates to engage in.
Q. Mr. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 9*, 764.

Fermanagh, Abolishing Police Stations in certain Rural Districts of.
Q. Mr. Jordan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 12*, 1182.

Gallagher, Sergeant, Pension of.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 9*, 765.

Galway, extra Charges in—Distinguishing from the case of Armagh.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 16*, 1374.

Irish Guards
Inducements offered to enlist in.
Q. Mr. Macveagh; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 11*, 1019.
Reservists from, Admission of.
Qs. Mr. Macveagh, Mr. J. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 9*, 768.

Longford Barracks—Temporary Prisoners—Improving Places of Detention.
Q. Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 4*, 394.

Public House Property, Constables having an Interest in—Stationing in another County.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 9*, 772.

Temperance Society joined by Constable Scully—Resignation of Members—Directing him to withdraw.
Q. Mr. Roche; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 11*, 1021-1022.

Constabulary (Ireland) Bill
c. 1R.* *May 10*, 899.

Contraband of War
Postal letters as—Right of belligerents to search British Mail Steamers.
Q. Sir C. Palmer; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 10*, 893.

Coopers Hill College
Maintaining, Expediency of.
Reports, etc., presented, *May 2*, 75, 90.

Cooscroum
Landing Place at—Date of commencing work.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 5*, 540.

Corbett, Mr. A. C. [Glasgow, Tradeston]
Licensing Bill, 2R., *May 10*, 976.
Compensation—Proportion between Brewery Companies and Actual Licencees, *May 5*, 535.

Corbett, Mr. T. L. [Down, N.]
Local Government (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill, 2R., *Apr. 29*, 36.

Corbridge Gas Bill
l. 3R.* *Apr. 29*, 2.

Cork
Post Office, Clerk at—Qualifications of Officer selected, etc.
Q. Mr. J. F. X. O'Brien; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 16*, 1368-1369.

Prison Infirmary—Death of Michael Curtin—Coroner's Jury's Verdict—Inquiring into conduct of Resident Magistrate, etc.
Qs. Mr. O'Shaughnessy, Mr. Sheehan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 11*, 1024-1026.

Cork, Earl of
United Irish League, Resolution of, to compel Sales by Landlords before May Rents become due, alleged, *May 10*, 878.

Cornwall
Harbours of Refuge in, Utility of—Capt. Frederick's Report.
Q. Mr. Soares; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *May 5*, 521.

Cottage Homes
Working of System.
Os. Mr. Crooks, *May 6*, 685, 686.

Cotton
Gambling in—Co-operating with Liverpool Exchange to prevent.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *May 11*, 1027-1028.

County Courts
Extension of Jurisdiction—Introducing Bill.
Q. Dr. Shipman; *A.* Sir R. Finlay, *May 9*, 739-740.

[*cont.*

County Courts—*cont.*
Ireland—Registrars, Fees and Salaries of—Return ordered, *May 12*, 1005.
Judges' Deputies, Expense of providing, Relieving Judges from Obligation to furnish.
Q. Mr. B. Jones; *A.* Sir R. Finlay, *May 6*, 644.

Courtown Harbour
Dredging of Entrance to.
Q. Sir T. Esmonde; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 9*, 763.
Additional Dredgers, providing.
Q. Sir T. Esmonde; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *May 12*, 1160.

Cows
Tuberculosis among — Report of Royal Commission—Date of Issue, etc.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. G. Lawson, *May 11*, 1017.

Craig, Mr. C. C. [Antrim, S.]
Local Government (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill, 2R., *Apr. 29*, 32.
Lough Neagh, Drainage of—Publication of Engineer's Report, etc., *May 16*, 1387.

Craig, Mr. R. H. [Lanarkshire, Govan].
Orange River Colony—Natives—Repatriation after the War, *May 5*, 532-533.

Cremer, Mr. W. R. [Shoreditch, Haggerston].
Licensed Premises—Ground Landlords of London, Number of Houses Closed by—Notice given, etc., *May 9*, 776.
Telegraph Service—Learners in Central Office — Promotion — *May 12*, 1154-1155.
Transvaal Labour Question—Natives in Mines, treatment of, *May 5*, 629.

Crimes (Ireland) Act, 1887
Abrogation of right to trial by jury.
Os. Mr. Boland, *May 4*, 462; Mr. H. Burke, 466; Mr. J. Redmond, 486.
Appeal against sentences, right of.
Os. Mr. Boland, *May 4*, 462; Mr. H. Burke, 463.
Change of venue and calling of special jury.
Os. Mr. Wyndham, *May 4*, 480, 481.
Classes of Crimes dealt with under.
Os. Mr. Atkinson, *Apr. 29*, 48–50.
History of.
O. Col. Saunderson, *May 4*, 472.
Lord-Lieutenant, powers of, under.
Os. Mr. Boland, *May 4*, 462, 463; Mr. W. Moore, 468.
Occasions on which the Act has been put into force.
Os. Mr. Hayden, *Apr. 29*, 25; Mr. Atkinson, 50–52; Mr. Wyndham, *May 4*, 482.
Police, powers given to, by.
Os. Mr. Boland, *May 4*, 462; Mr. H. Burke, 464, 465.

Crimes (Ireland) Act, 1887—*cont.*
Repeal of, proposed.
Os. Mr. Hayden, *Apr. 29*, 23, 26; Col. Saunderson, *May 4*, 473, 474; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 475; Mr. Wyndham, 478, 479, 483, 484.
Tribunal to administer, objections to constitution of.
Os. Mr. Boland, *May 4*, 462; Mr. H. Burke, 464.

Cripps, Mr. C. A. [Lancashire, Stretford]
Aged Pensioners Bill, 2R., *May 6*, 678, 687.
Licensing Bill, 2R., *May 9*, 796, 797, 802.

Crofters and Cottars, Scotland
See under Highlands and Islands of Scotland.

Crofton, Hugh, Estate of
Stamped receipts for rent and ejection costs, refusal of, alleged Inquiry, &c.
Qs. Mr. S. Macneill; *As.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *May 2*, 123, 124.

Crombie, Mr. J. W. [Kincardineshire]
Education [Scotland] Bill, 2R; *May 2*, 190.
Date of Committee Stage of, *May 5*, 539.

Cromore
Road to Gravir, cost of, inefficiency of Government survey.
O. Mr. Weir, *May 5*, 562.

Crooks, Mr. W. [Woolwich]
Aged Pensioners Bill, 2R.; *May 6*, 684.
Licensing Bill, 2R; *May 10*, 972.
Workhouses — Classification of inmates, working of Cottage Homes system, etc., *May 6*, 684–86.

Cross, Mr. H. S. [Bolton]
Motor Car Act—Report of Departmental Committee, Date of presenting, *May 3*, 243.

Crossbost, Isle of Lewis
Burying Ground, Acquisition of New.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *May 2*, 118, 119.

Crown Agents for the Colonies
Africa, South, Purchase of Supplies for.
Class of Requirements supplied—Restriction of Crown Agents' Powers, etc.
Qs. Mr. Rose, Mr. H. Samuel, Mr. A. Taylor; *As.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 2*, 105-106.
Commissions paid 1900–1903.
Q. Sir H. Fowler; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 9*, 749–750.
Articles for supply of which Tenders have been invited in the last three years, etc.
Q. Mr. H. Samuel; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 16*, 1375.

[*cont.*

Crown Agents for the Colonies—*cont.*
Commissions of
Africa, South, on goods purchased for, 1900-1903.
Q. Sir H. Fowler; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 2*, 750.
Return ordered *May 2*, 90.
Salaries, Commissions, etc.
Q. Mr. Scott-Montagu; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 13*, 1298-1299; *May 16*, 1375-1376.
Transactions for 1903—Granting Return showing Nature, Date, Amount involved, etc., of each Transaction.
Q. Mr. G. White; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 12*, 1163-1164.

Croydon Gas Bill
l. Rep.* *May 10*, 865.
3R.* *May 16*, 1358.

Crystal Palace District Gas Bill
c. Rep.* *Apr. 29*, 10.
*Con.** *May 6*, 638.
3R.* *May 10*, 880.
l. 1R.* *May 10*, 866.

Cullinan, Mr. J. [Tipperary, S.]
Ballyboy Farm, Right of Royal Artillery to exercise on — Interference with Settlement of evicted Tenants, *May 9*, 753.
Tipperary—Enforcing Local Government Surcharges, *May 5*, 540-541.

Cullooney
Railway Tickets not issued for, from Sligo, alleged.
Q. Mr. O'Dowd; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *May 2*, 124, 125.

Cummeen
Postal Service at — Granting increased facilities.
Q. Mr. Murphy, *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 16*, 1366-1367.

Cunard Line
Money Committee, Arranging for Discussion on.
Q. Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *May 12*, 1186.

Curtin, Michael
Death of, in Prison—Action of Magistrate in refusing Bail—Comment of Coroner's Jury.
Q. Mr. O'Shaughnessy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 16*, 1392.

Cusack Estate, Longford
Sale, Progress of—Return showing Names of intending Purchasers, etc.
Q. Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 4*, 388.

Customs and Excise
Alcohol for Manufacturing Purposes, freeing from payment of Duty, suggested.
Q. Sir E. Flower; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *May 2*, 100-101.

Customs and Excise—*cont.*
Law relating to, Amendment of, proposed—Resolution, *May 3*, 353.
Revenue derived from, 1899-1900—Estimated Amounts, 1904-5, etc.
Q. Mr. H. Samuel; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *May 5*, 526-527.
Tobacco Duty, *see* Tobacco.
Warehouse Accounts, Transfer of, to a different Department.
Q. Mr. E. Gray; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *May 5*, 523.

Dalziel, Mr. J. H. [Kirkcaldy Burghs]
Bishoprics of Southwark and Birmingham Bill, 2R., *May 4*, 445.
Provisional Order (Marriages) Bill, 2R., *May 3*, 367.
Taxation—War taxes, protest against continuance of, in time of peace, *May 3*, 304.
Unclaimed dividends on Government Stock, Appropriation of, to pay off Budget Deficit, *May 3*, 355.

Dartmoor Prison
Staff Quarters, Inadequacy of.
Q. Mr. C. Hay; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *May 3*, 251.

Davenport, Mr. W. B.—*Financial Secretary to the War Office* [Cheshire, Macclesfield]
Ballyboy Farm—Right of Royal Artillery to exercise on — Interference with Settlement of Evicted Tenants, *May 9*, 753-754.
Barracks, Island Bridge, Closing of—Expenditure on imported Carts and Wagons, 1900-1903, etc., *May 9*, 754.
Medical College—Progress of Building, *May 9*, 752.
Irish Garrisons, Military Stores for—Contract Value of Saddlery, etc., supplied from Woolwich, etc., *May 9*, 755.
Irish Rifles, Royal, 5th Battalion—Training at Downpatrick, *May 12*, 1184.
Militia and Volunteers, Royal Commission on, Effect of War Office Reconstitution on Report of, *May 9*, 755.
Officers' Uniforms—New Overcoats for the Footguards—Date of last Change, *May 9*, 756.
South African War — Natal Volunteer Ambulance Corps, granting Queen's Medals to, *May 9*, 753.

Davy, Lord
Street Betting Bill, 2R., *May 3*, 223; *Com.*, May 10, 867-871, 873, 874, 876.

Davies, Mr. A. [Carmarthen Boroughs]
Education, Wales.
Carmarthen County Council's breach of Act, Inquiry into, Date of Report, *May 2*, 117.

[*cont.*

Davies, Mr. A.—*cont.*

Education, Wales,—*cont.*

Grant, Apportionment of, *May 2*, 117.

Local Authorities failing to carry out the Act, Names of, etc., *May 2*, 98.

Nonconformist Children educated in Church Schools—Number, *May 5*, 538-539.

Historical Manuscripts, Welsh—Reports of Royal Commission, *May 5*, 538.

Deer Forests, Scotland

Area, Extension of — Statistics as to, granting.

Os. Mr. Weir, *May 5*, 559, 560; Mr. Harmsworth, 565; Mr. Ainsworth, 567.

Returns as to, inaccuracy of, Granting new, proposed.

Os. Mr. Weir, *May 5*, 559, 560, 570; Mr. Ainsworth, 567; Mr. A. G. Murray, 569.

Sheep Valuations, Effect of, on acreage.

Os. Mr. Ainsworth, *May 5*, 567; Mr. A. G. Murray, 569.

Defence of the Empire

Expenditure for military purposes—Amount expended under the Imperial Defence Act from 1888-1896.

Q. Mr. Runciman; *A.* Mr. Arnold Forster, *May 13*, 1296.

Delany, Mr. W. [Queen's County, Ossory]

Agriculture, Department of—Petition from clerks in veterinary branch, suppression of, by chief clerk—Interpolation of word "Roman" in the question, *May 16*, 1390-1392.

Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department, Ireland.

Funds disbursed—Total amount up to March 31st, 1904—Proportion paid in Salaries, etc., *May 9*, 747.

Officials Transferred from Veterinary Department, Number, Names, Salaries, etc., *May 10*, 896.

Barrow River, Inspection of, *May 13*, 1297.

Edge Estate, Queen's Co. — Progress of Sale—Provision for Thos. M'Cormack, *May 5*, 541.

Gallagher, Sergeant, R.I.C., Pension of, *May 9*, 765.

Paupers, Deportation of, to Ireland—Case of Frank Milner, *May 10*, 896; *May 12*, 1178.

Veterinary Officers, Compulsory Residence in Districts, *May 5*, 532.

Denbigh, Earl of

United Irish League, Resolution of, to Compel Sales by Landlords before May Rents become due, alleged, *May 10*, 877.

Derbyshire & Nottinghamshire Electric Power Bill

l. Rep.* *May 5*, 493.

3R.* *May 10*, 866.

c. 1R.* *May 13*, 1291.

Derry

See Londonderry.

Designs, Trade Marks, and Patents

Report presented, *May 13*, 1273; *May 16*, 1363.

De Trafford Estate Bill

l. 1R.* *May 3*, 221.

Development Fund, Ireland

Supplementary Estimate for, Items of—Date of tabling, etc.

Qs. Mr. J. Redmond, Mr. Kilbride; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 12*, 1173-1175.

Devlin, Mr. J. [Kilkenny, N.]

Crimes Act, Ireland, Administration of, *May 4*, 470.

Education, Ireland — Building Grants, Applications for, since 1901, etc., *May 12*, 1176.

Lisburn Hurling Matches, Disturbances with regard to—Steps to be taken, *May 9*, 769-770.

Local Government (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill, 2R., *April 29*, 41.

Devonshire

Harbours of Refuge in, utility of—Capt. Frederick's Report.

Q. Mr. Soares; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *May 5*, 521.

Dewar, Mr. J. A. [Inverness].

Congested Districts Board, Scotland.

Fisheries, assistance to, *May 5*, 574-78.

Holdings for Crofters and Cottars, purchase of land for, *May 5*, 572, 573.

Work of, *May 5*, 572, 574.

Education (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *May 2*, 196.

Dewar, Sir T. R. [Tower Hamlets, St. George's]

Aliens in British Prisons, *April 29*, 14.

Licensing Bill, 2R., *May 10*, 971.

Brewery Shareholders or Proprietors, allowing to act as Licensing Justices—Inserting clause in Bill, *May 9*, 761.

Lottery Circulars in connection with Drawings at Budapest—Postage in London—Instituting Inquiries, *May 9*, 744.

[*cont.*

Dewar, Sir T.—*cont.*

Plague spread by means of Rats—Fumigating Vessels from Plague-infected Ports, *May 3*, 250.

Smallpox in East London — Cause — Number of Patients removed by Metropolitan Asylums Board, *May 3*, 249–250.

Dickson, Rt. Hon. C. S.—*Lord Advocate* [Glasgow, Bridgton]

Education (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *May 2*, 137

Fisheries — "Goldseeker" — Quantity of Fish sold in April—Names of Places of Sale, etc., *May 12*, 1172.

Highland Crofting Counties—Inspectors of the Poor—Age limit and Medical Inspection for Appointments, *May 12*, 1172.

Lewis, Island of—Allocation of Equivalent Grant—Maintenance of Footpaths and Bridges, etc., *May 12*, 1173.

Dickson-Poynder, Sir J. [Wiltshire, Chippenham]

Business of the House, Course of, *May 12*, 1030.

Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir C. W. [Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean]

Finance Bill, 2R., *May 16*, 1418.

Financial Policy of the Government—Increase in Expenditure and Taxation, etc., *May 16*, 1418–1427.

Franco-Siamese Treaty — *Status* of Protected Subjects—Ratification of the Treaty—Terms recognised by Anglo-French Agreement, *May 12*, 1169.

Fusiliers, Royal 1st Volunteer Battalion, Court of Inquiry in—Taking Evidence on Oath, *May 13*, 1298.

India—Coolie Labour, Export of Indentured — Practice stopped by Government since 1870—Granting Return, *May 5*, 529.

Ministerial Office, Re-election on accepting, Bill to remove Necessity of, *May 3*, 267.

Norfolk Commission on Militia and Volunteers—Date of publishing Report, *May 4*, 381.

Volunteers.

Courts of Inquiry—Particulars as to Courts held 1903–4, *May 3*, 243.

Dingle

Railway to Tralee, Development Fund, Grant for.

Q. Mr. J. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 12*, 1173–1174.

District Messenger Service

Telephone attachment to dial, refusal of Post Office to sanction use of.

Os. Col. Lockwood, *May 12*, 1260; Lord Stanley, 1267.

Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. D. [Middlesex, Uxbridge]

Ray, River, Insanitary Condition of—Obliging Local Authorities to cleanse, *May 16*, 1366.

Dogs

Experiments on.

Number vivisected in University College, London, 1903.

Q. Dr. Shipman; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *May 4*, 375.

Smallpox Virus, Inoculation of Dogs with.

Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *May 10*, 893.

Licenses for Keeping—Fines, Average Amount of, Number of Persons fined, &c.

Qs. Mr. Weir; *As.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *May 10*, 891.

Doncaster Corporation Bill

c. *Con.** *May 3*, 236.

3R.* *May 6*, 638.

l. 1R.* *May 9*, 702.

Donegal Railway Bill

c. *Con.** *Apr. 29*, 10.

3R.* *May 3*, 236.

l. 1R.* *May 5*, 494.

2R.* *May 13*, 1270.

Donelan, Capt. A. J. C. [Cork, E.]

Bank of Ireland, Government Money passing through, Terms of Arrangement as to, *May 12*, 1157.

Land Purchase—Sales to Tenants—Exorbitant Demands of Landlords, *May 11*, 1024.

Mails between Queenstown and Plymouth, Facilities for Handling, *May 3*, 260.

Donoughmore, Earl of

Rifles, New Service, Cost, &c., *May 13*, 1282.

Dorington, Rt. Hon. Sir J. E. [Gloucester, Tewkesbury]

Baronetcies, Wrongful Assumption of, Alleged—Committee of Inquiry proposed, *May 16*, 1365.

Liquor Licenses refused by Quarter Sessions, Right of Appeal, *May 3*, 240–241.

Lunacy.

Commission of, Constitution and Working of, *May 12*, 1207–1208.

Inquiry into whole question of, proposed, *May 12*, 1209.

Institutions for treatment of incipient cases, establishment of, proposed, *May 12*, 1208, 1209.

Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. A. Kent, St. Augustine's]

Accidents, Fatal, due to open Fire Grates, granting Return relative to, *Apr. 29*, 13–14.

[*cont.*

Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. A.—*cont.*
- Aliens in British Prisons, *Apr. 29*, 14.
- Animals, experiments on.
  - Dogs.
    - Number vivisected in University College, London—Number in 1903, *May 4*, 375.
    - Smallpox Virus, Inoculation with, *May 10*, 893.
  - Metropolitan Asylums Board, Application from, to register a Place, *May 5*, 523.
  - Returns for 1903, Date of publishing, *May 4*, 375.
- Scientific results obtained during past year, *May 16*, 1383.
- Army—Punishment of Soldiers—Number in prisons, and number whose sentences involve discharge from the Army, *May 10*, 894.
- Bail Act, Effect of—Bringing Provisions to Notice of Justices and their Clerks, *May 2*, 93-94.
- Baronetcies, wrongful assumption of, alleged—Committee of Inquiry, proposed, *May 16*, 1365.
- Ecclesiastical Commissioners, Legal Expenses of—Instituting Inquiry, *May 4*, 374-375.
- Factories and Workshops, Fire Precautions in—Appointing Select Committee, *May 12*, 1153.
- Fire, Precautions against, in Institutions under Government control, *May 4*, 374; *May 12*, 1153.
- Gambling, Prosecutions for, during past ten years, *May 16*, 1382.
- Licensing Bill, 2R., *May 9*, 807; *May 10*, 992.
  - Brewery Shareholders or Proprietors allowing to act as Licensing Justices—Inserting Clause in Bill, *May 9*, 761.
  - Charges, Imposition and Collection of, *May 9*, 741.
  - Compensation—Brewery Companies and Actual Licencees, Proportion between, *May 5*, 535-536.
  - Off-Licence Holders, inclusion of, in Provisions of Bill, *May 3*, 251-252.
  - Quarter Sessional Areas, Number of, *Apr. 29*, 13.
- Liquor Licensing, etc.
  - Compensation for withdrawal of Licence, granting to Brewery Servants holding Licences, *May 3*, 240.
  - Leaseholders of Licensed Premises deprived of Licences—Position as to existing Covenants, *May 6*, 646.

Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. A.—*cont.*
- Liquor Licensing, etc.—*cont.*
  - Licensed Premises.
    - Hotels, Ale and Beerhouses—Granting Classified Return by County and County Boroughs etc., *May 12*, 1152.
    - Values, Aggregate Annual, in each County and County Borough, *May 5*, 524.
      - Estimated Value unlicensed—Granting Return, *May 9*, 740.
  - Licences, Proportion of, to Population, England and Wales, 1880, etc., *May 4*, 384.
  - Renewal of Licence, Refusal of.
    - Number in past Five Years, etc.—Granting Return, *May 9*, 740.
    - Quarter Sessions, by—Right of Appeal, *May 3*, 241.
    - Quarter Sessions, Decisions of Licensing Justices reversed by 1894-1903, *May 2*, 94-95.
- Little Canfield, Refusal of Vicar of to read Burial Service, *May 16*, 1365.
- Omnibus Drivers and Conductors—Suspension of Licences by Police Authority, *May 3*, 240.
- Prisons.
  - Dartmoor—Inadequacy of Staff Quarters, *May 3*, 251.
  - Soldiers in—Number imprisoned and number whose sentences involve discharge from the Army, *May 10*, 894.
- Vans, Covered, London County Council Bye Law as to—Issuing Regulations to Police, Proceedings against Messrs. Carter, Paterson & Co., &c., *May 16*, 1383.
- Workmen's Compensation Act 1897, Amendment of—Progress of Inquiry, *May 16*, 1382.

Douglas, Mr. C. M. [Lanarkshire, N.W.]
- Congo Free State, Administration of—Communications to Signatories of Berlin Act—Replies received and Date of Tabling, *May 11*, 1016-1017.
- Education [Scotland] Bill, 2R., *May 2*, 159.

Downpatrick
- Royal Irish Rifles, 5th Battalion, Training of, at Downpatrick.
  - *Q.* Mr. Wood; *A.* Mr. B. Davenport, *May 12*, 1184.

Drogheda, Marquess of
- Kildare Property of—Sale to Tenants—Reinstatement of Evicted Tenants.
  - *Q.* Mr. Kilbride; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 12*, 1181-1182.

Dublin
Bicycle Thefts in, Statistics as to.
Q. Mr. Mooney; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 16*, 1388.
College of Science, Appointment of Architect for.
Q. Mr. Mooney; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *May 12*, 1182–1183.
Authority Responsible for Selection of.
Q. Mr. Mooney; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *May 9*, 775.
Englishman, Dissatisfaction at Appointment of.
Qs. Mr. Field, Mr. Mooney, Mr. J. Redmond; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *May 6*, 395.
Irish Departments, Consulting with—Employment of Irishman.
Q. Mr. Mooney; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 16*, 1387–1388.
County Infirmary—Medical Staff—Election to Vacancies.
Q. Mr. Clancy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 6*, 644.
Marlborough Street Training College—Granting Return dealing with Students.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 6*, 647.
Post Office.
Extra Officials sent over from England on Occasion of the King's Visit, Grievances as to.
O. Mr. Nannetti, *May 12*, 1247, 1248.
Female Supervisors in, Discontinuance of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Nannetti; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 3*, 259.
Trinity College Head Rents, Redemption of—Price Demanded—Scale Fixed by Land Commission, etc.
Qs. Mr. Flavin, Mr. T. W. Russell; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 12*, 1180–1181; *May 16*, 1393–1394.

Duke of York's Military School, Chelsea.
Disposal of Site.
Q. Mr. Whitmore; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *May 12*, 1162.

Duncan, Mr. J. H. [Yorkshire, W.R., Otley]
Transvaal, Importation of Chinese Labour to — Commissariat Arrangements, *May 16*, 1378.

Dundee
Post Office, Deliveries in, Conditions of Work, Inadequacy of Staff, etc.—Delay in Reply to Memorial as to.
O. Sir J. Leng, *May 12*, 1229.

Dundrum
Petty Sessions — Appointing Additional Magistrates.
Q. Mr. K. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 5*, 544.

Dundrum Estate, Tipperary
Fair Rent Appeals, Fixing Date for Hearing.
Q. Mr. K. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 16*, 1386.

Dunleary
Old Harbour of—Sale of Portion of Foreshore, Minute Presented, *May 4*, 372; *May 5*, 495.

Dunmanway
Electoral Divison — Dividing into two Divisions.
Q. Mr. E. Barry; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 5*, 532.

Durning-Lawrence, Sir E. [Cornwall, Truro]
Licensing Bill, 2R. *May 10*, 960.
Navy—Prizes of War, introducing Consolidating Bill as to, *May 3*, 266.
Spirits, Taxation of, *May 3*, 342–343.

Ebbw Vale Urban District Water Bill
l. 3R.* *Apr. 29*, 2.
c. 1R.* *May 2*, 88.
2R.* *May 11*, 1001.

Ecclesiastical Commissioners
Legal Expenses of—Instituting Inquiry.
Q. Mr. Humphreys-Owen; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *May 4*, 374-375.

Ecclesiastical Disorders
see Ritualistic Practices.

Edge Estate, Queen's County
Sale of, Progress of—Provision for Thos. M'Cormack.
Q. Mr. Delany; Mr. Wyndham, *May 5*, 541.

Education
Compulsory Attendance, Limitation of, in Case of Children between five and seven residing at a Distance.
Q. Mr. Hunt; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *May 3*, 242.
Expenditure on, increase in, References to, in debate on the Finance Bill, *May 16*, 1431, 1453, 1467.
Ireland.
Archonry Schools—Name of Manager—Appointing Rev. B. Dunn, etc.
Qs. Mr. O'Dowd; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 9*, 767–768; *May 12*, 1175.
Blackrock Secondary Schools, Provision of Funds for—Committee Resolutions.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 4*, 390.
Building Plans, Decision as to Applications for Grants, etc.
Qs. Mr. Boland, Mr. J. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 12*, 1176–1177.
Commissioners' Report presented, *May 12*, 1150; *May 13*, 1271.
Development Fund Grants for Training Colleges.
Q. Mr. J. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May, 12*. 1174.

[*cont.*

Education—*cont.*

Ireland—*cont.*

Evening Schools—Regulations as to Grants.
Q. Mr. Sheehan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 10*, 897.

Irish Language, *see that title.*

Mount Bellew — School built by Private Effort—Sanctioning Expenditure for Technical Instruction.
Q. Mr. Roche; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 12*, 1177-1178.

St. Patrick's Training College—Delay in awarding Teaching Diplomas.
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 12*, 1161.

School Attendance Committee, Reason for debarring Teachers from acting as Secretaries to.
Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 16*, 1372.

Teachers, *see title* National School Teachers.

Training Colleges, *see that subheading.*

Local Authorities failing to carry out the Act, Names of, etc.
Q. Mr. A. Davies; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *May 2*, 98.

London County Council Committee — Public and Press, exclusion of, from meetings.
Q. Mr. Atherley-Jones; A. Sir W. Anson, *May 16*, 1384.

Monmouthshire.

Appointed day in.
Q. Mr. McKenna; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *May 12*, 1155.

Population of each local area.
Q. Mr. J. H. Lewis; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *May 6*, 647.

National Council—Approval of Scheme by the Board—Tabling Copy, etc.
Q. Mr. G. Kenyon; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *May 5*, 539.

Rate.

Children, Detention of, during Playtime in consequence of Parents' Refusal to pay.
Q. Mr. Rose; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *May 11*, 1005.

Part Payment of, Accepting.
Q. Sir B. Gurdon; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *May 3*, 242.

Religious Instruction.

Children Attending after the Hour for, Detention of, during Playtime.
Q. Mr. Rose; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *May 11*, 1005-1006.

Secondary Schools, making Grant conditional on—Cases.
Q. Mr. Humphreys-Owen; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *May 4*, 386, 387.

Education—*cont.*

Schools.

Achonry — Name of Manager — Appointing Rev. B. Dunn, etc.
Qs. Mr. O'Dowd; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 9*, 767-768; *May 12*, 1175.

Blackrock Secondary, provision of funds for — Committee Resolutions.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 4*, 390.

Elementary—Code of Regulations for, presented, *May 9*, 703, 738.

Erbusaig — Unsatisfactory Water Supply—Steps to remedy.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *May 16*, 1364.

Hayward's Heath—New School—Date of publishing Report of Board of Inquiry.
Q. Mr. J. F. Hope, *A.* Sir W. Anson, *May 3*, 242.

Mount Bellew — School built by Private Effort — Sanctioning Expenditure for Technical Instruction.
Q. Mr. Roche; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 12*, 1177-1178.

Scotland.

Circular Letters of Department, Selection of—Copy presented, *May 12*, 1150; *May 13*, 1271.

Continuation Classes—Reports and Statistics, presented, *May 9*, 703, 738.

Erbusaig School — Unsatisfactory Water Supply—Steps to remedy.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *May 16*, 1364.

Lewis, Island of — Maintenance of Footpaths and Bridges, etc.—Equivalent Grant.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. S. Dickson, *May 12*, 1172-1173.

Secondary and Technical.

Ireland.

Blackrock Schools, provision of funds for—Committee Resolutions.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 4*, 390.

Mount Bellew—School Built by Private Effort—Sanctioning Expenditure for Technical Instruction.
Q. Mr. Roche; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 12*, 1177-78.

Religious Instruction, making Grant conditional on—Cases.
Q. Mr. Humphreys-Owen; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *May 4*, 386-387.

[*cont.*

Education—*cont.*
Teachers.
Election of, as Members of Education Authorities — Proposed Government Action.
Q. Mr. Mansfield ; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *May 16*, 1383.

Music, of—Registration, Delay as to.
Q. Mr. Agg-Gardner ; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *May 5*, 524-525.

Training Colleges, Ireland.
Free Homes for—Resolution of Roman Catholic Bishops.
Q. Mr. Boland ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 3*, 253.

Grants.
Development Fund, Grant from.
Q. Mr. J. Redmond ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 12*, 1174.

Increase of—Estimated Increase in Number of King's Scholars.
Q. Mr. W. McKillop ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 5*, 543-544.

Marlborough Street—Granting Return dealing with Students.
Q. Mr. Boland ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 6*, 647.

St. Patrick's—Delay in awarding Teaching Diplomas.
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 12*, 1161.

Wales.
Carmarthen County Council breach of Act, Inquiry into, Date of Report.
Q. Mr. A. Davies ; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *May 2*, 117, 118.

County Councils, Prejudice of, against Voluntary Schools, alleged.
Os. Bishop of St. Davids, *May 9*, 714 ; Earl Cawdor, 715.

Grant to, Apportionment of.
Q. Mr. A. Davies ; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *May 2*, 117.

Nonconformist Children educated in Church Schools—Number.
Q. Mr. A. Davies ; A. Sir W. Anson, *May 5*, 538-539.

Population of each Local Area.
Q. Mr. J. H. Lewis ; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *May 6*, 647.

Education, Board of
President—Marquess of Londonderry.
Parliamentary Secretary—Sir W. R. Anson.

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (Birmingham) Bill
l. 1r.* *Apr. 29*, 3
2r.* *May 10*, 866.

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill
l. 2r.* *May 3*, 223.
Rep.* *May 13*, 1271.
3r.* *May 16*, 1358.

Education Board Provisional Orders (Cardiff and Newport (Monmouthshire) Bill
c. 1 r.* *May 4*, 370.

Education Department, Scotland
Vice-President of Council—Mr. A. Graham Murray.
Secretary—Sir Henry Craik.

Education (Local Authority Default) Bill
Proceeding with.
Q. Capt. Clive ; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *May 3*, 268.
Secondary Schools, extending Operation to,
Q. Mr. Brigg ; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *May 4*, 377.
c. 2 r., *May 2*, 128.
Committee Stage of, Arrangements as to.
Q. Mr. Crombie ; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *May 5*, 539.
Debate on Second Reading [Commons], *May 2*, 128.
Advisory Councils.
Scheme for, 163, 164.
University representation on, 164.
Applicability of the Bill to all parts of Scotland, 146, 152.
Areas.
Ad hoc area adjusted to requirements of education, necessity for, 131, 134, 135, 141, 146, 147, 158, 191, 204, 208.
Administration of, by counties, or County Council districts in disregard of existing areas, objections to, 129-131, 136, 138, 139, 142, 160, 185, 207.
Aggregation of existing parishes and boroughs into districts for primary education, etc., proposed, 135, 141, 184, 208.
Boundary Commission to suit educational wants of districts, proposed, 146, 158, 209.
County as area, with powers to sub-divide into districts, 167, 184-186, 191, 194, 197.
Qualifications, suitability of divisions, etc., 131-133, 145.
Population of, analysis of, 133, 134, 185.
Authority.
Ad hoc authority, 129, 135, 178, 203.
County Councils, Reasons for exclusion of, 164, 166, 186.
Election of, by ratepayers, 129.

[*cont.*

Education (Local Authority Default) Bill—*cont.*
- *Debate—cont.*
  - Authority—*cont.*
    - Local Authorities, Nomination of representatives of, 140, 147.
    - Women, Presence of, on Boards, 179.
  - Condition of Scotland as compared with Wales, 172.
  - Cookery, Instruction in, proposed, 157.
  - Cumulative Vote, Abolition of, 178, 196.
  - Curriculum, Proposals as to, 156, 157.
  - Fees, Scale of, 151, 152.
  - Financial proposals, Criticism on, 168, 169, 178, 205, 206, 210.
    - Uniform Municipal or County Rate proposed, 169.
  - Fund, Administration of, 150, 154, 159, 161, 162, 170, 173, 178-182, 189, 192, 211, 212.
  - Grants, System of, 148, 170.
  - Highland Districts, Special treatment for, proposed, 196, 197, 200.
  - Managers.
    - Appointment of, by School Boards instead of by Parish Council, proposed, 191, 198.
    - Powers and duties of, 176, 184, 189, 191, 194, 204.
  - Meals, Provision of, 156, 177, 200, 201, 202.
  - Medical inspection of schools and school children, proposed, 156, 157, 176, 177.
  - National Council, establishment of, proposed, 165, 183, 195.
  - Parish School System, Abolition of, necessary owing to University standard, 138, 139.
  - Parliamentary control, Inadequacy of, 162, 163, 192.
  - Physical training of children, Necessity for, 156, 201.
  - Provincial Councils, Constitution and Powers of, Regulation as to Nomination, etc., 136, 151, 158, 165, 166, 175, 183, 190, 199, 206.
  - Referring Bill to Select Committee, proposed, 154.
  - Religious Question.
    - Differences, Possibility of, 147, 149, 153, 160, 161, 174, 181.
    - Instruction in Schools, Methods adopted, 148, 198.
  - Sanitary Provisions — Objections to Dual Authority, etc., 171.
  - School Boards.
    - Constitution and Powers of, 194, 205.
    - Continuation of System, 143, 168.

Education (Local Authority Default) Bill—*cont.*
- *Debate—cont.*
  - School Boards—*cont.*
    - Debts of Parishes, taking over—Exception of Debts on Buildings, 192, 206.
    - Elections, Holding, on same date as County and Burgh Council Elections, proposed, 182, 196.
    - Parish Councils, Power of Combination with, proposed, 145, 168, 175.
    - Powers to be given to, 168.
    - Subordinate Boards of Management, Establishment of, 132.
    - Voluntary Schools, Power as to granting Money Aid, etc., 148, 149, 153, 160, 174, 181, 184, 205, 212.
    - Work of, and secret of success, 143, 144, 159.
  - Scottish Education Department.
    - Decentralisation of Powers, proproposed, 172-174, 176, 180, 189, 212-214.
    - Removal of Head Office to Edinburgh, proposed, 137, 174.
  - Secondary and Technical Education, Extending facilities for, 187, 188.
  - Teachers.
    - Appointment of, to be outside scope of Manager's functions, 176, 184, 189.
    - Pensions, Provisions as to, 192.
    - Qualifications of, 154.
    - *Status* of, Improvement in, 155, 188, 195.
    - Training of
      - Colleges, Improvement in methods of training in, and State assistance to, 155, 189.
      - Provisions as to, 154, 195, 199.
      - Scientific Training, Necessity for, 156.
  - Voluntary Schools, Position of, 148, 149, 153, 160, 174, 181, 184, 205, 212.

Education [Transferred Schools] Bill
- *l.* 1R., *May 10*, 704.
- *Debate on First Reading, May 9*, 704.
  - Religious Instruction,
    - Conference between County Councils and representatives of Voluntary Schools in Wales, terms agreed upon by, etc., 706, 711, 718.
    - Efficiency of Teachers, test of, Objections to, 718.
    - Local Authorities, powers of—freedom of Contract proposed, 706, 707, 710, 712, 715.

Education [Transferred Schools] Bill—*cont.*—
  Debate—cont.
    Religious Instruction—*cont.*
      Methods of imparting, Examinations, etc., 707, 720.
      Undenominational teaching, Types of, 707.
    Welsh County Councils, Prejudice of, against Voluntary Schools, alleged, 714, 715.

Egypt
  Administrative Policy of Lord Cromer, success of
    O. Mr. T. Taylor, *May 16*, 1494, 1495.
  Penny Postage, extension of, to, proposed
    Os. Mr. H. Heaton, *May 12*, 1228; Mr. H. C. Richards, 1232.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill
  c. Rep.* *May 6*, 641.
    *Con.** *May 9*, 736.
    3R.* *May 10*, 880.
  l. 1R.* *May 10*, 866.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill
  l. 2R.* *May 6*, 634.
    *Com.** *May 13*, 1271.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill
  l. 2R.* *May 6*, 634.
    *Com.** *May 13*, 1271.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill
  l. 1R.* *Apr. 29*, 3, 4.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill
  l. 1R.* *Apr. 29*, 3, 4.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill
  l. 1R.* *May 2*, 74, 75.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill
  c. 1R.* *May 13*, 1290.

Elibank, Master of [Edinburgh, Midlothian]
  New Guinea, British—Reported Disturbances—
    Inquiry, Instituting, *May 4*, 381–382.
    Statement, Making, *May 12*, 1164.

Ellenborough, Lord
  Merchant Shipping Bill, 2R., *May 9*, 729.

Ellice, Capt. E. C. [St. Andrews Burghs]
  Army Chaplains, Scottish—Allowing the Free Church a Share of Appointments, *May 2*, 103.

  Cattle,
    Canadian, Importation of—Removing Restrictions, *May 4*, 385.

Ellice, Capt. E. C.—*cont.*
  Cattle—*cont.*
    Tubercular, Sale of, for Breeding Purposes — Suggested Restriction, *May 4*, 386.
  Whale-hunting off the Scottish Coast, injury caused to Herring Fisheries by, etc., *May 5*, 565.

Ellis, Mr. J. E.—*Temporary Chairman of Committees* [Nottingham, Rushcliffe]
  Borough Councils, Indebtedness of—Date of presenting Return, *May 11*, 1008.
  Port of London Bill, Date of resuming Debate on, *May 11*, 1143.
  Salisbury, Late Marquess of, erection of Statue of, proposed, *May 16*, 1399.
  Transvaal.
    Chinese Labour, Importation of—Cape Colony Legislative Assembly, Resolution of, against—Terms—Date of Adopting, *May 11*, 1014.
    Magistracy, Return relative to, Date of presenting, *May 11*, 1015.
    Natives in mines, treatment of, *May 5*, 617–619.

Elysée Palace Hotel Company Bill
  c. Rep.* *May 6*, 640.

Emigration and Immigration
  British Colonies, Immigration Regulations in.
    Q. Mr. Brigg; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 4*, 380.
  Canada.
    Immigrants into, 1902–3, Numbers and Nationality of.
      Q. Mr. D. A. Thomas; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *April 29*, 17.
    Immigration Regulations in.
      Q. Mr. Brigg; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 4*, 380.
  Ireland—Statistics for 1903—Connaught Statistics — Holding Committee of Inquiry.
    Q. Dr. Ambrose; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 3*, 252.

Emmott, Mr. A. [Oldham]
  Bishoprics of Southwark and Birmingham Bill, 2R., *May 4*, 423.
  Congo Free State.
    Atrocities, alleged — Letter from Belgian Consul-General at Liverpool, Steps to be taken regarding, *May 9*, 759.
    Sentence passed on Silvanus Jones, Steps to be taken with regard to, *May 5*, 758.
  Licensing Bill, 2R., *May 10*, 980, 982, 993.

Enniskillen
  Urban County District Order presented, *April 29*, 4, 11.

Erbusaig School
- Water Supply, unsatisfactory—steps to remedy.
  - *Q.* Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *May 16*, 1364.

Erroll, Earl of
- Rifles, New Service, Introduction of, *May 13*, 1286.

Esmonde, Sir T. G. [Wexford N.]
- Courtown Harbour, dredging entrance to, *May 9*, 763.
  - Additional Dredgers, Providing, *May 12*, 1160.
- Ferns Postmaster—Appointment of Liverpool Town Postman—Qualifications for Post, etc., *May 12*, 1153.
- Fishing Piers, South East Irish Coast, Improvement of, *May 4*, 390.
- Milwr and District Mines Drainage Bill, 2R., *May 9*, 833.
- National Bank of Ireland—Receivable Order under Land Purchase Act, 1903—Form proposed, *May 11*, 1011.
- Whisky, Irish, Foreign Spirit sold as—Communication from co. Wexford Agricultural Society, *May 5*, 531.
- Works, Board of, Ireland—Act establishing, Money spent by, etc., *April 29*, 15.

Essex Yeomanry
- Army Manœuvres, Employment in—Question of Pay.
  - *Q.* Sir C. Rasch; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *May 3*, 244.

Estate Duties
- Licensed Premises, on, *see* Liquor Licensing, etc.—Licensed Premises.

Estimates.
- [*See also* Army, Civil Service, and Navy Estimates.]
- Acceptance of, by the House, responsibility entailed by.
  - *O.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 16*, 1401.
- Committee to examine and report on, prior to discussion in Committee of Supply, proposed—References to, in debate on the Finance Bill, *May 16*, 1430, 1483.
- Growth of, References to, in debate on the Finance Bill, *May 16*, 1403, 1404, 1414.
- Motions for Economy, etc., time for bringing up.
  - *O.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *May 16*, 1416.
- Supplementary, objections to system of, References to, in the debate on the Finance Bill, *May 16*, 1457-1458.
- Table attached to each particular Estimate showing the decennial growth, proposed.
  - *O.* Mr. H. Fisher, *May 16*, 1430.
- Votes, choice of, for discussion, difficulty of obtaining views of Members as to.
  - *O.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *May 16*, 1416-1417.

Ether.
- War Office Stores, used in Manufacture of—Allowing for Duty in Price paid, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. E. Gray; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *May 12*, 1158.

Evans, Mr. S. T. [Glamorganshire, Mid.]
- Bishoprics of Southwark and Birmingham Bill, 2R., *May 4*, 446.
- Workmen's Compensation Act, 1897, Amendment of—Progress of Inquiry, *May 16*, 1382.

Evictions, Ireland
- Carlow—Names of those making Applications for Restoration, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. Hammond; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 12*, 1160.
- Edge Estate, Sale of — Provision for Thomas M'Cormack.
  - *Q.* Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 5*, 541.
- Kerry.
  - Number of Evicted Tenants and of Restorations under the Act of 1903 in.
    - *Q.* Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 12*, 1175-1176.
  - Re-instatement of Tenants in, Steps taken by Commissioners towards.
    - *Q.* Mr. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 16*, 1389.
- Return presented, *May 2*, 75, 76, 91.
- Settlement of Tenants — Inspector to report on Properties for Sale, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 3*, 257.
- Waterford, Applications for Re-instatement in—Granting Return.
  - *Q.* Mr. Power; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 5*, 531-532.

Expenditure
- *See* Revenue and Expenditure.

Exports and Imports
- Canadian Cattle, Importation of—Removing Restrictions.
  - *Q.* Captain Ellice; *A.* Mr. A. Fellowes, *May 4*, 385.
- Coal — Quantity exported at declared Values — Statistics Jan. to Mar., 1903.
  - *Q.* Mr. D. A. Thomas; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *May 2*, 98-99.
- Tea, Impure, excluding Imports of.
  - *Q.* Sir S. King; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *May 2*, 101.

Factories and Workshops
- Fire Precautions—Appointing Select Committee.
  - *Q.* Mr. Tennant; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *May 12*, 1152-1153.
- Woollen, Worsted and Shoddy Factories subject to inspection, etc., Return ordered, *May 2*, 90.

Fair Rent Appeals
- Dundrum Estate—Date of hearing.
  - *Q.* Mr. K. O'Brien ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 16*, 1386.

Fair Rents, Ireland
- Powerscourt Estate—Date of completing Cases.
  - *Q.* Mr. T. W. Russell ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 12*, 1152.

Falchorrib
- Pier at—Date of commencing Work.
  - *Q.* Mr. H. Law ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May* 3, 253–254.

Farquharson, Dr. R. [Aberdeenshire, W.].
- Army.
  - Medical College—Progress of Building, *May 9*, 752.
  - Nurses, Improvement in Pay of, *May 2*, 103.
- Congested Districts Board, Work of, *May 5*, 555.
- Highlands, development of resources of, *May 5*, 557.
- Lunacy.
  - Bill of 1900, Re-introduction of, proposed, *May 12*, 1212.
  - Commission on, Constitution and Duties of, *May 12*, 1200.
  - Inquiry into whole question of, proposed, *May 12*, 1198, 1200.
  - Pathological institutions for study of, establishment of, proposed, *May 12*, 1199.

Farrell, Mr. J. P. [Longford, N.]
- Ballymahon Magisterial Bench, Appointing Roman Catholic to Vacancy on, *May 3*, 255.
- Belturbet Post Office — New Building, local Objection to — Reconsidering Plans, *May 3*, 262.
- Evicted Tenants, Settlement of—Inspector to report on Properties for Sale, etc. *May 3*, 257.
- Galbraith Estate, County Tyrone — Purchase by Commissioners—considering Tenants' Applications, *May 4*, 393–394.
- Local Loans—Rate of Interest—Reverting to Former Rate, *May 3*, 258, 259.
- Longford.
  - Abusive Soldier at, taking Action against, *May 4*, 387-388.
  - Cusack Estate—Progress of Sale—Return showing Names of intending Purchasers, etc., *May 4*, 388.
  - Police Barracks—Temporary Prisoners—Improving Places of Detention, *May 4*, 394.
  - Post Office—arrangements as to Night Work, *May 3*, 263.
- Workhouse Hospitals—Obligation to admit Military Patients, *May 3*, 257.

Fee Fund
- House of Lords—Account presented, *May 13*, 1273.

Fellowes, Mr. A. E. [Huntingdonshire, Ramsey]
- Acreage of Wheat, Barley, and Total Corn, Produce and Average Price, 1849–1853, 1899-1903, in England, Scotland and Ireland, *May 9*, 742–744.
- Cattle.
  - Canadian, Importation of—Removing Restrictions, *May 4*, 385-386.
  - Tubercular, Sale of, for Breeding Purposes—Suggested Restriction, *May 4*, 386.
- Kew Gardens, Lots Eyot facing Entrance to, proposed Barge Dock at—Making Protests, *May 12*, 1156, 1157.
- Navy—Battleships—Speed Trials on the Cornish Coast—Damage to Fisheries, *May 4*, 376.
- Railways—Rates and Transit Facilities.
  - Committee of Inquiry, placing Tenant Farmers on, *May 9*, 762.
  - Milk, Carriage of—Locked Churns—Circulating Explanatory Leaflet, *May 9*, 763.
  - Scotland, High Charges in, on Agricultural Produce—Reply from Railway Companies to Board of Agriculture, *May 16*, 1371.

Fenwick Mr. C. [Northumberland, Wansbeck]
- Members of Parliament.
  - Expenses imposed on, by Returning Officers, *May 11*, 1109-1112.
  - Payment of, proposed, *May 11*, 1110, 1112-1115.
- Transvaal, Importation of Chinese labour to—Unskilled Work, provisions for restriction to, *May 2*, 108.

Ferguson, Mr. R. C. M. [Leith Burghs]
- Congested Districts Board—Combining powers of, with those of the Crofters Commission, proposed, *May 5*, 571.
- Licensing Bill, 2R., *May 9*, 853, 860.
- Liquor Licensing — Scotland — Licences withdrawn for Causes other than Misconduct since 1880—Number, May 9, 745.

Fergusson, Rt. Hon. Sir J., [Manchester, N.E.]
- Aged Pensioners Bill, 2R., *May 6*, 699.
- Bishoprics of Southwark and Birmingham Bill, 2R., *May 4*, 446.

Fermanagh
- Police Stations, abolishing, in certain Rural Districts.
  - *Q.* Mr. Jordan ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham *May 12*, 1182.

Ferns, Wexford
Postmaster—Appointment of Liverpool Town Postman — Qualifications for Post, etc.
Q. Sir T. Esmonde ; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 12*, 1153-1154.

Ffrench, Mr. P. [Wexford, S.]
Land Purchase.
Annual Report of Commissioners 1903–4—Date of Publication, etc., *May 3*, 256.
Colclough Estate, Wexford, expediting Sale of, to Tenants, *May 3*, 255.
Rowe Estate, Sale of—Delay, etc., *May 2*, 122.
Cause of Delay, *May 4*, 391.
Templetown Postal Arrangements—Providing increased Facilities, *May 3*, 261.

Field, Mr. W. [Dublin, St. Patrick]
Bovine Tuberculosis—Report of Royal Commission—Date of Issue, etc., *May 11*, 1017.
Butchers, Paddington—Sanitary Inspectors' Instructions regarding Pig Carcases, *May 4*, 384.
Cotton, Gambling in, co-operating with Liverpool Exchange to prevent, *May 11*, 1027–1028.
Dublin College of Science, Architect of—Dissatisfaction at Appointment of Englishman, *May 6*, 395.
Education—Blackrock Committee Resolutions—Providing Funds to erect Schools, *May 4*, 390.
Galloway Bulls, Purchase of, under Agricultural Department's Live Stock Schemes, *May 4*, 390.
Local Government (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill, 2R., *Apr. 29*, 17.
Railway Rates for Agricultural Produce—Departmental Committee of Inquiry, Form of, etc., *May 11*, 1027.

Filey Improvement Bill.
l. Rep.,* *May 16*, 1357.

Finance Bill
(*For details of debate, see* Revenue and Expenditure, Taxation, Army and Navy Estimates, etc.).
c. 1R.,* *May 3*, 366.
Date of Second Reading, and facilities for discussion.
Qs. Mr. Lough, Mr. J. Redmond ; *As.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *May 3*, 366.
2R., *May 16*, 1400.

Financial Secretary to the Admiralty.
Mr. E. G. Pretyman.

Financial Secretary to the War Office.
Mr. W. Bromley-Davenport.

Finlay, Sir R. B.—*Attorney-General* [Inverness Burghs]
Church of England—Athanasian Creed, Changes made in, by Convocation, introducing Bill to legalise, or to separate Church and State, *May 11*, 1008.
County Courts.
Extension of Jurisdiction—Introducing Bill, *May 9*, 739–740.
Judges' Deputies, relieving Judges from Expense of providing, *May 6*, 644.
Lunacy.
Bill of 1900—Re-introduction of, proposed, *May 12*, 1212.
Commissioners, Increase in number of, and re-arrangement of work, proposed, *May 12*, 1210.
Increase in, alleged, *May 12*, 1209.
Institutions for treatment of incipient cases, establishment of, proposed, *May 12*, 1211.
Scottish system of management, success of, *May 12*, 1209.

Fire
Factories and Workshops, Precautions in —Appointing Select Committee.
Q. Mr. Tennant ; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *May 12*, 1152–1153.
Fatal Accidents due to open Grates, granting Return relative to.
Q. Mr. A. Henderson ; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *Apr. 29*, 13–14.
Institutions under Government Control, Precautions in.
Q. Mr. H. C. Richards ; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *May 4*, 373–374.

First Commissioner of Works
Lord Windsor.

First Lord of the Admiralty
Earl of Selborne.

First Lord of the Treasury
Mr. Arthur J. Balfour.

Fiscal Policy
Changes in, proposals as to, and effect of, on Trade, etc., References to, in debate on the Finance Bill, *May 16*, 1411, 1412, 1420–1422, 1485–1487.

Fisher, Mr. W. H. [Fulham]
Finance Bill, 2R., *May 16*, 1427.
Financial Policy of the Government—Increase in Expenditure and Taxation, etc., *May 16*, 1427–1432.

Fisheries
"Goldseeker"—Quantity of Fish sold in April—Names of places of Sale, etc.
Q. Mr. Weir ; *A.* Mr. S. Dickson, *May 12*, 1172.

[*cont.*

Fisheries—*cont.*

Ireland.

Close season off Donegal Coast, extending Area affected.
Q. Mr. O'Doherty; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Apr. 29*, 16.

Cooscroum Landing Place—Date of commencing Work.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 5*, 540.

Dingle Union, Need for larger Piers in—Sending Inspector to Report.
Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 11*, 1022-1023.

Dredgers.

Additional, for the South-East Coast, Provision of.
Q. Sir T. Esmonde; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *May 12*, 1160.

Development Fund, Provision from.
Q. Mr. Kilbride; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 12*, 1174, 1175.

Fishermen's Insurance Scheme, delay in putting, into Operation.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 5*, 539, 540.

Labourers Acts, Inclusion of Fishermen under, proposed.
Qs. Mr. Sheehan; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 10*, 894, 895.

Rossbeg—Landing Accommodation, providing additional.
Q. Mr. H. Law; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 3*, 254.

South-East Coast—Improvement of Piers.
Q. Sir T. Esmonde; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 4*, 390.

Valentia Harbour, Telegraph Office at, continuing during the Fishery Season.
Qs. Mr. Boland, Mr. Flavin; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 12*, 1183.

Naval Speed Trials, Damage on the Cornish Coast due to.
Q. Sir L. Molesworth; *A.* Mr. A. Fellows, *May 4*, 376.

Scotland.

Congested Districts Board, assistance from, proposed.
Os. Mr. J. Dewar, *May 5*, 574-78; Mr. Weir, 587.

Herring Industry.

Motor power for fleets, provision of, proposed.
O. Mr. C. Wason, *May 5*, 552.

Fisheries—*cont.*

Scotland—*cont.*

Herring Industry—*cont.*

Whale-hunting off the coast, damage caused by.
Os. Mr. Asher, *May 5*, 563, 564; Cap. Ellice, 565; Mr. Harmsworth, 565; Mr. Maconochie, 566; Mr. A. G. Murray, 567, 568.

International Committee for North Sea Investigations—Treasury Contribution, etc.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *May 5*, 537-538.

"Jackal," H.M.S. — Absence from Police Duties on Research Work—Appointing Substitute.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *May 16*, 1377.

Report, Annual, presented, *May 5*, 495, 519.

Report of the Board, Date of Publication.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *May 16*, 1364.

Transit of, and rates of carriage.
Os. Mr. Maconochie, *May 5*, 581; Mr. Weir, 583.

Sea.

North — International Committee — Treasury Contribution towards Scottish Portion of Work, etc.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *May 5*, 537-538.

Fishguard

Railway to Rosslare, Negotiations concerning.
Q. Mr. J. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 12*, 1174-1175.

Fitzmaurice, Lord E. G. [Wiltshire, Cricklade].

Lunacy.

Increase in, alleged, *May 12*, 1205.

Inquiry into whole system of, proposed, *May 12*, 1206, 1207.

Fitzroy, Mr. E. A. [Northamptonshire, S.]

House of Commons, Hour of Meeting, Amending Standing Order as to, *May 3*, 269.

Flannery, Sir J. F. [Yorkshire, Shipley]

Aged Pensioners Bill, 2R., *May 6*, 689.

Personal Insinuations made in Question Time, Regulation to restrain, *May 5*, 548.

Volunteers—Retired Sergeants — Regulations as to wearing Uniform, *May 9*, 748.

Flavin, Mr. M. J. [Kerry, N.]

Constabulary, authority of, to stop Bands performing in Public, *May 11*, 1018.

Flavin, Mr. M. J.—*cont.*
- Land Purchase—Future Tenants, Purchase of Holdings by—Remedy against Exorbitant Demands, *May 9*, 763.
- Local Government (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill, 2R., *Apr. 29*, 58.
- Trinity College, Dublin—Head Rents—Price demanded, etc., *May 12*, 1180, 1181; *May 16*, 1393-1394.
- Valentia Harbour, continuing Telegraph Office at, during the Fishery Season, *May 12*, 1183.

Florence Knox Estate, Mayo
- Purchase of Untenanted Lands by Estates Commissioners.
  - *Q.* Mr. O'Dowd; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 9*, 767.

Flower, Sir E. F. S. [Bradford, W.]
- Alcohol for Manufacturing Purposes, freeing, from Payment of Duty suggested, *May 2*, 100.

Florin, New
- Design of—Name of Designer, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. E. Griffiths; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *May 9*, 760-761.

Flynn, Mr. J. C. [Cork, N.]
- Agrarian Offences—Discontinuing Returns, *May 4*, 393.
- Bishoprics of Southwark and Birmingham Bill, 2R., *May 4*, 451.
- Cahirciveen River, Authority responsible for placing Buoys and Perches in Estuary of, *May 16*, 1385.
- Land Commission—Commissioner acting in a district in which he has personal interests—Case of Mr. G. Bolster, *May 16*, 1373.
- Land Purchase Acts, tabling Rules framed under, *May 5*, 542.
- Munster Dairy School, Allocation of Grant for, *May 4*, 394.
- Registration of Clubs (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *May 6*, 657.
- Taxation—War taxes, protest against continuance of, in time of peace, *May 3*, 304, 341.
- Tibet Expedition—Advance to Lhasa.
  - Adjournment of House to discuss, moving, *May 12*, 1186.
  - Delaying, pending Discussion in the House, etc., *May 16*, 1378, 1379.
  - Explanation of—Sanction of Chinese Government, *May 12*, 1166-1167.
- Whiskey, Tax on, Protests against continuance of, *May* 3, 341-2.

Foot Guards
- Officers, New Overcoats for—Date of last Change of Uniform.
  - *Q.* Sir C. Rasch; *A.* Mr. B. Davenport, *May 9*, 755-756.

Foreign Office
- *Secretary of State*—Marquess of Lansdowne.
- *Under-Secretary*—Earl Percy.

Foster, Sir B. W. [Derbyshire, Ilkeston]
- Aged Pensioners Bill, 2R., *May 6*, 697.
- Poor Law, Administration of, Improvements in system of, *May 6*, 698.
- Poor Law Institutions, Corporal punishment in, Regulation of, *May 10*, 887.
- Tobacco duties, Increase in—Budget proposals, *May* 3, 287-291.
- Transvaal—Importation of Chinese Labour to.
  - Hong-Kong.
    - Cost of housing intending Emigrants at, etc., *May 12*, 1165.
    - Plague, Alleged outbreak of, among labourers at, etc., *May 9*, 756-757.

Foster, Sir M. [London University]
- Lunacy.
  - Inquiry into whole question of, proposed, *May 11*, 1197.
  - Institutions for treatment of incipient cases, Establishment of, proposed, *May 12*, 1197.
  - Medical Commissioners, Increasing number of, proposed, *May 12*, 1196.

Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir H. H. [Wolverhampton, E.]
- Africa, South, Supplies for—Purchase of, by Crown Agents—Commissions paid 1900-1903; *May 9*, 749-750.
- British Guiana—Indian Coolie Immigration Ordinance—Approval of Colonial and Indian Offices, etc.—Opportuuity for discussing Charges made, *May 12*, 1184-1186.
- Business of the House, Course of, *May 2*, 127.
- Charing Cross to the Mall, Date of completing Road from, etc., *May 4*, 373.

France
- Arbitration Treaty with Great Britain. Date of Discussion on.
  - *Q.* Mr. G. Ormsby-Gore; *A.* Mr A. J. Balfour, *May 3*, 266.
  - Siam, French Convention with—*Status* of Protected Subjects—Ratification of the Convention.
    - *Q.* Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Earl Percy, *May 12*, 1169.
- Money orders to, Rate charged for.
  - *O.* Mr. H. Heaton, *May 12*, 1226.
- Navy.
  - Battleships built in 1900 and 1904—Total Numbers for France and Germany combined.
    - *Q.* Mr. Yerburgh; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *May 16*, 1376.

[*cont.*

France—*cont.*
  Navy—*cont.*
    Expenditure, apart from War Expenditure, in each of the past twenty-five years.
      Q. Mr. Runciman ; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *May 13*, 1295-1296

  Telegrams to, rate from Great Britain. *Os.* Mr. L. Sinclair, *May 12*, 1224 ; Lord Stanley, 1256.

  Trade Report, Presented, *May 2*, 75.

Fraserburgh
  Naval Reserve Battery at, Establishment of.
    Q. Mr. Maconochie ; *A.* Mr. A. Lee, *May 2*, 102-103.

Friendly Societies
  Unregistered -- Income-tax deductions, Rule as to recovery of.
    Qs. Mr. G. Whiteley ; *As.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *May 5*, 536, 537 ; *May 10*, 891, 892.

Funded and Unfunded Debts
  see under National Debt.

"Furnessia"
  "Scotia," Services rendered to—Salvage claims against vessels owned by the Crown, Recovery of.
    Os. Lord Muskerry, *Apr. 29*, 5 ; Duke of Marlborough, 7.

Fusiliers, Royal, 1st Volunteer Battalion
  Court of Inquiry in—Taking Evidence on Oath.
    Q. Sir C. Dilke ; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *May 13*, 1298.

Galbraith Estate, Co. Tyrone
  Purchase by Commissioners—Considering Tenants' Applications.
    Q. Mr. J. P. Farrell ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 4*, 393-394.

Galloway Bulls
  Purchase of, under Live Stock Schemes, Agricultural Department, Ireland.
    Q. Mr. Field ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 4*, 390-391.

Galway
  Extra Police Charges remitted in—Distinguishing from the Case of Armagh.
    Q. Mr. Lonsdale ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 16*, 1374.

Gambling
  Budapest, Lottery Drawings at—Postage of Circulars in London by English Agents—Instituting Inquiry.
    Q. Sir T. Dewar ; *A.* Earl Percy, *May 9*, 744.

  Cotton in, Co-operating with Liverpool Exchange to prevent.
    Q. Mr. Field ; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *May 11*, 1027-1028.

Gambling—*cont.*
  Prosecutions Instituted in each of last Ten Years.
    Q. Mr. Mansfield ; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *May 16*, 1382.

Garryhinch Estate, Queen's County
  Date of Placing, in Land Judge's Court—Steps to effect a Sale.
    Q. Mr. Delaney ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 9*, 764.

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill
  l. 1R.* *May 2*, 74, 75.

Gas Companies
  Metropolitan—Account presented, *May 2*, 76, 89.

Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill
  l. 1R.* *May 2*, 74, 75.

Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill
  l. 1R.* *May 2*, 75.

Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 3) Bill
  l. 1R.* *May 2*, 75.

Gas Undertakings
  Return of all Authorised Undertakings—Ordered, *May 10*, 885.

Germany
  Navy.
    Expenditure, apart from War Expenditure, in each of the past Twenty-five Years.
      Q. Mr. Runciman ; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *May 13*, 1295-1296.

    Shipbuilding.
      Battleships built in 1900 and 1904—Total Numbers for France and Germany combined, etc.
        Q. Mr. Yerburgh ; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *May 16*, 1376.

      Numbers, in various Classes, of Ships building 1894 and 1904.
        Q. Mr. Yerburgh ; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *May 16*, 1370.

      Programme of 1900, Adherence to.
        Q. Sir J. Colomb ; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *May 16*, 1369-1370.

  Trade Report, Presented, *May 3*, 223 ; *May 9*, 703.

Gilhooly, Mr. J. [Cork Co., E.]
  Baltimore.
    Harbour—Condition of Beacon, *May 2*, 125.

    Postal Service — Affording increased Facilities, *May 3*, 262-263.

  Castletown, Berehaven--Postal Facilities—Granting improved Service, *May 5*, 519-520.

Goddard Mr. D. F. [Ipswich]
  Southport Post Office—Appointment of Postmaster's Son—Rule as to Relatives in same Office, *May 12*, 1154.

Gordon, Mr. J. [Londonderry, S.]
  Registration of Clubs (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *May 6*, 664.

Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir. J. E. [Cambridge University]
  Bishoprics of Southwark and Birmingham Bill, 2R., *May 4*, 435.
  Licensing Bill, 2R., *May 11*, 1052.
  Transvaal Labour Question — Central African Natives imported to the Mines, Mortality among, *May 11*, 1013.

Gortnasate
  Pier at—Date of Commencing work.
    Q. Mr. H. Law ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 3*, 253-254.

Gosport Water Bill
  c. Rep.* *Apr. 29*, 10.
    *Con.** *May 6*, 638.
    3R.* *May 16*, 1463.

Goulding, Mr. E. A [Wilts, Devizes]
  Aged Pensioners Bill, 2R., *May 6*, 669.

Government Departments
  Securities held by, Amounts, etc.
    Return, Presented, *May 12*, 1150.

Government Stock
  Unclaimed Dividends.
    Appropriation of, to pay off Budget deficit.
      Os. Mr. Dalziel, Mr. Whitley, *May 3*, 355 ; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 356, 357 ; Sir H. Fowler, 358 ; Mr. McCrae, 359 ; Sir J. Leng, Sir J. Joicey, 361 ; Mr. Martin, 362 ; Mr. H. Samuel, 363 ; Mr. Lough, 364.
    Cancelling and realising, difference between.
      Os. Sir J. Brunner, *May 3*, 357, 363 ; Mr. G. Bowles, 3 57 ; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 357, 363 ; Mr. Levy, 362 ; Mr. Weir, 364.
    Efforts made to discover the owners.
      Os. Sir J. Leng ; Sir J. Joicey, *May 3*, 361 ; Mr. Martin, 362 ; Mr. Weir, 365.
    Transfer of, to National Debt Commissioners—Efforts made to trace shareholders.
      Qs. Mr. Weir ; *As.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *May 10*, 890, 891.

Granard Workhouse
  Master, Dismissal of—Reasons, etc.
    Q. Mr. Sloan ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 16*, 1385-1386.

Grant, Mr. C. [Warwickshire, Rugby]
  Beer, excise duties on—Higher tax on beer sold in tied houses, proposed, *May 3*, 336.

Grants-in-aid
  System of, objections to, Reference to, in Debate on the Finance Bill, *May 16*, 1477, 1478.

Gravir
  Road to Cromore, cost of, inefficiency of Government survey.
    O. Mr. Weir, *May 5*, 562.

Gray, Mr. E. [West Ham, N.]
  Army Store—Ether used in Manufactured Goods—Allowing for Duty in Price paid, etc., *May 12*, 1158.
  Customs Service—Transfer of Warehouse Accounts to a different Department, *May 5*, 523.

Great Central Railway Bill
  c. 3R.* *Apr. 29*, 9.
  l. 1R.* *May 2*, 74.

Great Eastern Railway (Steamboats) Bill
  l. 3R.* *May 2*, 74.
  c. Lords' Amendments agreed to, *May 6*, 638.

Great Northern and City Railway (Extension of Time) Bill
  l. 3R.* *Apr 29*, 2.

Great Western Railway Bill
  l. Report from Select Committee, *May 16*, 1357.

Great Yarmouth Corporation Bill
  l. Report from Select Committee, *Apr. 29*, 3.
    Rep.* *May 5*, 493.
    3R.* *May 10*, 866.
  c. 1R.* *May 13*, 1291.

Greece
  Trade Report, presented, *May 2*, 75 ; *May 9*, 703.

Gretton, Mr. J. [Derbyshire, S.]
  Licensing Bill, 2R., *May 11*, 1041.
  Liquor Licensing, etc.—Leaseholders of Licensed Premises deprived of Licences—Position as to existing Convenants, *May 6*, 646.

Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E. [Northumberland, Berwick]
  Members of Parliament.
    Expenses imposed on, by Returning Officers, *May 11*, 1124, 1125.
    Payment of, proposed, *May 11*, 1125-1129.

Griffith, Mr. E. J. [Anglesey]
  Bishoprics of Southwark and Birmingham Bill, 2R., *May 4*, 431, 450, 451.

[*cont.*

Griffith, Mr. E. J.—*cont.*
  Florin, New—Errors in Design—Name of Designer, etc., *May 9*, 760-761.
  Licensing Bill, 2R., *May 10*, 1000 ; *May 11*, 1033, 1038.

Gurdon, Sir W. B. [Norfolk, N.]
  Education Rate—Accepting Part Payment of, *May 3*, 242.
  Finance Bill, 2R., *May 16*, 1446.
  Financial Policy of the Government—Increase in Expenditure and Taxation, etc., *May 16*, 1446-1450.
  Members of Parliament, payment of, proposed, *May 11*, 1118, 1119.

Gun Licences
  Ireland—Martin Jennings, reasons for depriving, of Gun, etc.
    Q. Mr. Roche ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 11*, 1021.

Hain, Mr. E. [Cornwall, St. Ives]
  Merchant Shipping (Lighthouses) Bill, 2R., *May 13*, 1317.

Haldane, Rt. Hon. R. B. [Haddington]
  Education (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *May 2*, 171.
  Transvaal Labour Question— Natives in mines, Mortality among, steps taken to check, *May 5*, 616.

Halfpenny Postage
  See under Post Office.

Halsbury, Earl of—(*Lord Chancellor*).
  Bills of Exchange Act 1882, Amendment Bill, 2R., *May 9*, 735.
  Prevention of Corruption Bill, *Com.*, *May 9*, 734.
  Outdoor Relief (Friendly Societies) Bill—Breach of Privilege in originating in House of Lords, *May 5*, 496, 498.
  Prize Courts, Administration of Oaths by Naval Captains in, *May 9*, 734.
  Street Betting Bill, *Com.*, *May 10*, 868, 872, 875.

Hammond, Mr. J. [Carlow]
  Carlow, Evicted Tenants in—Names of those making Applications for Restoration, etc., *May 12*, 1160.

Hampton-in-Arden Gas Bill
  l. 3R.* *Apr. 29*, 3.
  c. Lords' Amendments *Con.* *May 5*, 515.

Harcourt, Mr. L. V. [Lancs, Rossendale]
  Navy — Battleships, First class — Annual Cost of Maintenance in Commission, *May 6*, 646.

Hardwicke, Earl of—*Under-Secretary for India.*
  Tibet, Expedition to, Information as to, *May 9*, 704.

Harlow and Sawbridgeworth Gas Bill
  c. Rep.* *May 6*, 641.
    Con. *May 16*, 1361.

Harmsworth, Mr. R. L. [Caithness-shire]
  Deer Forests, Scotland, Acreage of, Statement showing growth of, proposed, *May 5*, 565.
  Whale-hunting off the Scottish Coast, injury caused to Herring Fisheries by, etc., *May 5*, 565.

Harrington, Mr. T. [Dublin Harbour]
  Merchant Shipping (Lighthouses) Bill, 2R., *May 13*, 1329.

Harrogate Waterworks Tramroad Bill
  l. Report from Select Committee, *Apr. 29*, 2.
    3R.* *May 3*, 221.
  c. 1R.* *May 5*, 517.
    2R.* *May 16*, 1361.

Harrow Road and Paddington Tramways Bill
  c. 3R.* *Apr. 29*, 9.
  l. 1R.* *May 2*, 74.
    2R.* *May 13*, 1270.

Haslett, Sir J. H. (Belfast, N.)
  Local Government (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill, 2R., *Apr. 29*, 27, 45.

Hay, Mr. C. G. D. [Shoreditch, Hoxton]
  Army—Punishment of Soldiers—Number in prisons and number whose sentences involve discharge from the Army, *May 10*, 894.
  Coastguard Service—Dwellings, Inspection of, under Health Acts, *May 10*, 889, 890.
  Dartmoor Prison — Inadequacy of Staff Quarters, *May 3*, 251.
  Education [Scotland] Bill, 2R., *May 2*, 200.
  Housing of Working Classes—Administration of Acts, Transfer of, to Local Government Board proposed, *May 2*, 115, 116.
  Local Government Board and Board of Trade, Duties, etc., of, Committee of Inquiry into—Date of Report, *May 2* 112.
  Post Office
    Grievances of Employees, allowing discussion of, *May 12*, 1265.
    Indian Mail [Service—Departmental Committee of Inquiry, tabling Report of, *May 12*, 1265.
    Wages Committee—Date of tabling Report—Opportunity for Discussion, *May 3*, 249.

Hayden, Mr. T. P. [Roscommon, S].
  Constabulary, Authority of, to stop Bands performing in Public—Case of Sergeant Frizelle, Frenchpark, *May 11*, 1018.
  Land Purchase—Division of Untenanted Lands, by Commissioners—Treatment of Herds, *May 9*, 765-766.

[*cont.*

Hayden, Mr. T. P.—*cont.*
Local Government (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill, 2R., *Apr. 29*, 23.
Roscommon Quarter Sessions—Notifying Jurors in the Absence of Criminal Business, *May 3*, 252.
Tredinnick Estate, Expediting Sale of, *May 16*, 1389.

Hayward's Heath
School at—New Building—Date of Publishing Report of Board of Inquiry,
Q. Mr. J. F. Hope; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *May 3*, 242.

Heaton, Mr. T. H. [Canterbury]
Post Office
Blunders of, granting Compensation for, *May 12*, 1227.
Letter boxes—Placing in through trains, proposed, *May 12*, 1227.
Letters
Insufficient postage on, Abolition of Fines for, proposed, *May 12*, 1226.
Morning delivery, Delay in, *May 12*, 1227.
Recall of letters posted by mistake, Relaxing rules as to, proposed, *May 12*, 1227.
Registration fee, Reduction of, proposed, *May 12*, 1226.
Lottery Circulars, Suppression of, proposed, *May 12*, 1227.
Magazines, High Rates of Postage charged for, *May 12*, 1228.
Money Orders.
Delivery of Money at Payee's Address, proposed, *May 12*, 1226.
England to France, Rate charged for, *May 12*, 1226.
Penny Post.
Australia, Negotiations with, as to, *May 12*, 1225.
Egypt, Inclusion of, in, proposed, *May 12*, 1228.
Universal, Efforts made to Establish, *May 12*, 1225.
Postal Orders, Fines on, *May 12*, 1226.
Samples, Conveyance of — Granting increased facilities, proposed, *May 12*, 1226.
Stamps.
Country of Origin, Indicating, *May 12*, 1227.
Foreign, Facilities for Purchase of, at General Post Office, *May 12*, 1227.
Universal, Necessity for, *May 12*, 1227.
Telegraph Forms, Prepaid, not used within two months — Refunding money, proposed, *May 12*, 1226.

Hemphill, Rt. Hon. C. H. [Tyrone, N.]
Local Government (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill, 2R., *Apr. 29*, 64.
Post Office—Cash on Delivery System, Decision as to, *May 12*, 1224.

Henderson, Mr. A. [Durham, Barnard Castle]
Deaths from Burns due to open Grates, granting Return relative to, *Apr. 29*, 13.
Members of Parliament.
Expenses imposed on, by Returning Officers, *May 11*, 1105-1107.
Payment of, proposed, *May 11*, 1107-1109.

Hereford, Lord Bishop of
Street Betting Bill, *Com. May 10*, 869, 875.

Herring Fisheries, Scotland
Motor Power for Fleets, provision of, proposed.
O. Mr. C. Wason, *May 5*, 552.
Whale-hunting off the Coast, Damage done to Fisheries.
Os. Mr. Asher, *May 5*, 563, 564; Capt. Ellice; Mr. Harmsworth, 565; Mr. Maconochie, 566; Mr. A. G. Murray, 567, 568.

Highlands and Islands of Scotland
Agricultural Produce, Transit Facilities, Rates Charged, etc.
O. Mr. Weir, *May 5*, 560, 561.
Crofters and Cottars.
Commission Report, presented, *May 9*, 703, 738.
Co-operation among, Encouragement of.
Os. Mr. M. Ferguson, *May 5*, 572; Mr. J. Dewar, 573; Mr. Leveson-Gower, 579.
Holdings for, Purchase of Land by the Congested Districts Board.
Os. Mr. J. Dewar, *May 5*, 572, 573; Mr. Ainsworth, 579; Mr. Weir, 583; Mr. A. G. Murray, 589, 590.
Inspectors of the Poor—Age Limit and Medical Inspection for Appointments.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. S. Dickson, *May 12*, 1172.
Seed, Failure of the Congested Districts Board to Distribute.
Os. Mr. J. Dewar, *May 5*, 573; Mr. Leveson-Gower, 579; Mr. Weir, 582.
Crofting Counties.
Deaths, Laxity in Certifying—Introducing Legislation.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *May 16*, 1397-1398,
[*cont.*

Highlands and Islands of Scotland—*cont.*
Crofting Counties—*cont.*
Inspectors of the Poor—Age Limit and Medical Inspection for Appointments.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. S. Dickson, *May 12*, 1172.
Population, Decrease in—Appointment of Select Committee of Inquiry, proposed.
Os. Mr. Ainsworth, Mr. A. G. Murray, *May 11*, 1141.
Fish, Affording Facilities for Transit of, and Lowering Rates, proposed.
Os. Mr. Maconochie, *May 5*, 581; Mr. Weir, 583.
Lewis, Island of, *see that title.*
Orkney, *see that title.*
Peat Industry, Development of, proposed.
Os. Mr. Maconochie, *May 5*, 581; Mr. Weir, 582.
Resources of, Development of, Work of Lady Cathcart Gordon.
Os. Dr. Farquharson, *May 5*, 557; Mr. Weir, 558, 582; Mr. Maconochie, 581; Mr. A. G. Murray, 589.

Historical Manuscripts
Welsh—Reports of Royal Historical Commission.
Q. Mr. A. Davies; *A.* Mr. A. Cavendish, *May 5*, 538.

Historical Manuscripts (Royal Commission)
Report presented, *Apr. 29*, 4, 12.

Hobhouse, Mr. C. E. H. [Bristol, E.]
Somaliland Campaign.
Illig, Capture of — Continuance of Operations, etc., *May 2*, 110.
Supplementary Estimates, Date of Tabling, *May 12*, 1170.

Hobhouse, Rt. Hon. H. [Somersetshire, E.]
Licensed Premises.
Aggregate Annual Values in each County and County Borough, *May 5*, 523–524.
Hotels, Ale and Beerhouses—Granting Classified Return according to County and County Boroughs, etc., *May 12*, 1152.
Valuation, Method of, for Estate Duty—Tabling Papers, *May 3*, 248; *May 5*, 527.
Licensing Bill, 2R., *May 10*, 988, 997.

Holywell
Effect of the Milwr and District Mines Drainage Scheme upon.
Os. in Debates on the Milwr and District Mines Drainage Bill, *May 9*, 833, 836, 838, 839, 840; *May 12*, 1241.

Holywood Tramways Bill
l. Report from Select Committee, *May 13*, 1270.

Home Office
Secretary of State—Mr. A. Akers Douglas.
Under Secretary—Mr. T. H. A. E. Cochrane.

Home Rule, Ireland
Granting, proposed.
Os. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 4*, 477; Mr. J. Redmond, 485.

Hong-Kong
Chinese Emigrants for the Transvaal, Cost of Housing of, etc.
Q. Sir W. Foster; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 12*, 1165–1166.
Plague at, Postponing Introduction of Chinese into the Transvaal during the Prevalence of, etc.
Qs. Mr. Weir, Sir W. Foster, Mr. Buchanan; *As.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 9*, 756-757.

Hope, Mr. J. F. [Sheffield, Brightside]
Hayward's Heath, New School at—Date of publishing Report of Board of Inquiry, *May 3*, 242.
Indian Army, New Batteries for—Date of issuing Orders to Private Firms, *May 3*, 243–244.
Merchant Shipping (Lighthouses) Bill, 2R., *May 13*, 1327.
Spirits, Taxation of, *May 3*, 344–347.

House of Commons
See under Parliament.

House of Lords
See under Parliament.

Housing of the Working Classes
Administration of Housing Acts, Transfer of, to Local Government Board, proposed.
Qs. Mr. C. Hay; *As.* Mr. Long, *May 2*, 115, 116.
Ireland.
Farmers, Small, Housing of—Making Provision in Labourers (Ireland) Bill.
Q. Mr. Sheehan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 11*, 1017.
Legislation, Proposed.
Qs. Mr. Nannetti; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 2*, 120, 121.
London (Providence Place, Poplar) Improvement Scheme, 1890—Statement of Modifications in, Presented, *May 6*, 634, 643.

Huddersfield Corporation Act, 1902 (Amendment) Bill
c. con. May 3*, 236.
3R.* *May 6*, 638.
l. Commons' Amendts. *con.* May 10*, 865.

Humber Commercial Railway and Dock Bill
c. 3R.* *Apr. 29*, 9.
l. 1R.* *May 2*, 74.
2R.* *May 10*, 865.

Humphreys-Owen, Mr. A. C. [Montgomery]
Bishoprics of Southwark and Birmingham Bill, 2R. *May 4*, 452.
Ecclesiastical Commissioners, Legal Expenses of—Instituting Inquiry, *May 4*, 374.
Education, Secondary and Technical—Religious Instruction, Making Grant Conditional on—Cases, *May 4*, 386.

Hunt, Mr. R. [Shropshire, Ludlow]
Education—Limiting Compulsory Attendance in Case of Children between 5 and 7 Living at a Distance, *May 3*, 242.
Rifle, New Pattern—Increased Recoil, Steps to Remedy, *May 3*, 244.

Hutcheson's Hospital and Hutcheson's Educational Trust Bill
l. Report from Select Committee, *May 13*, 1270.

Hutchinson, Dr. C. F. [Sussex, Rye]
Licensing Bill, 2R. *May 10*, 902.
Quarter Sessional Areas, Number of, *Apr. 29*, 13.
Lunacy, Inquiry into General Question of, proposed, *May 12*, 1204.

Hutton, Mr. J. [Yorkshire, Richmond]
Aged Pensioners Bill, 2R. *May* 6, 675, 684.
Workhouses—Classification of Inmates and Provision of Separate Accommodation for Imbeciles, *May 6*, 675, 676.

Hyde Park
Motor Cars, Speed Regulations for.
Qs. Mr. C. Wason; *As.* Lord Balcarres, *May 2*, 116.

Illig
Capture of—Continuance of operations, &c.
Q. Mr. C. Hobhouse; *A.* Earl Percy, *May 2*, 110.

Imperial Defence Act
Expenditure for Military Purposes—Amount expended in each Year from 1888 to 1896.
Q. Mr. Runciman; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *May* 13, 1296.

Income Tax
Abatements—Estimated Total Amount liable to be paid for Year 1903-4.
Q. Mr. J. H. Lewis; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *May 12*, 1171-1172.
Additional 1d. in the pound.
O. Mr. McCrae, *May 16*, 1439.
Collection of—Difference between English and Scotch Systems.
Q. Sir J. Stirling-Maxwell; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *May 2*, 98.

Income Tax—*cont.*
Friendly Societies, Unregistered—Rule as to Recovery of Deductions.
Qs. Mr. G. Whiteley; *As.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *May 5*, 536, 537; *May 10*, 891, 892.
Graduation of, Proposed.
O. Mr. Beckett, *May 16*, 1445.

India
Army.
Batteries, New—Orders for Private Firms, Date of issuing.
Q. Mr. J. F. Hope; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *May 3*, 243-244.
Drafts for—Landing in the Hot Season.
Q. Capt. Norton; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *May 5*, 533-534.
Organisation of—Tabling Lord Kitchener's Memorandum.
Q. Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *May 16*, 1371-1372.
Competitive Examinations for Public Services, Abolition of—Application to Natives—Patronage Regulations.
Q. Capt. Nolan; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *May 5*, 535.
Coolie Labour, Export of Indentured—Practice stopped by Government—Instances since 1870—Granting Return.
Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *May 5*, 529.
Coolie Labour imported into British Guiana—Approval of Ordinance by Colonial and Indian Offices—Albert Hall Speech—Allowing Opportunity for Discussion.
Q. Sir H. Fowler; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *May 12*, 1184-1186.
Coopers Hill College, Expediency of Maintaining.
Reports, etc., Presented, *May 2*, 75, 90.
Finance.
Accounts for 1902-3, Presented, *May 12*, 1150; *May 13*, 1272.
Estimate of Revenue and Expenditure, 1903-4, Presented, *May 12*, 1150.
Comparison with 1902-3, Presented, *May 13*, 1272.
Nett Income and Expenditure from 1892 to 1903.
Return Presented, *May 11*, 1004.
Mail Service.
Contribution to.
Q. Mr. Buchanan, *May 2*, 112; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, 112.
Departmental Committee of Inquiry, Tabling Report of.
Os. Mr. C. Hay, *May 12*, 1265; Lord Stanley, 1268.

[*cont.*

India—*cont.*

Police Service—Adopting Committee Recommendations—Estimated Increased Annual Cost.
Q. Mr. H. Roberts; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *May 16*, 1372.

Rubber Cultivation by Government in Burma and other Places—Discontinuing Experiments.
Q. Mr. G. Boscawen; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *May 5*, 529-530.

Seistan Boundary Commission—Estimated Cost of Work—Defraying Cost, etc.
Q. Mr. Schwann; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *May 3*, 246-247.

Tibet, *see that title.*

Inebriate Reformatories

Detention Regulations.
Q. Mr. L. Morgan; *A.* Mr. Cochrane, *May 2*, 113.

Management and Discipline, Regulations. Presented *May 12*, 1151; *May 13*, 1272.

Inland Revenue

Law relating to, Amendment of, Proposed. Resolution, *May 3*, 353.

Inverclyde, Lord

Merchant Shipping Bill, 2R. *May 9*, 728.

Inverness

Prison, Constitution of Visiting Committee. Rule Presented, *May 11*, 1004; *May 13*, 1272.

Ipswich Dock Commission Bill

c. con. Apr. 29*, 10.
3R.* *May 5*, 515.
l. Commons' Amendts. *con.* May 9*, 701.

Ireland

Lord Lieutenant—Earl of Dudley.
Chief Secretary—Mr. George Wyndham.
Lord Chancellor—Lord Ashbourne.
Attorney General—Mr. J. Atkinson.

Achonry, *see that title.*

Agrarian Outrages, *see that title.*

Agriculture—Statistical Return Presented, *May 6*, 634, 643.

Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department, *see that title.*

Arklow Harbour, Improvement of—Report of Board of Works Engineer, Circulation of, &c.
Qs. Mr. J. O'Connor; Mr. J. Redmond; *As.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *May 2*, 124.

Armagh Workhouse—Master's Salary, Reason for Raising, etc.
Q. Mr J. Campbell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 5*, 542.

Aughris—Scheduling as Congested District, proposed—Facilities Afforded for Development of Fishing Industry, &c.
Q. Mr. W. McKillop; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 10*, 895.

Ireland—*cont.*

Avondale Estate, Wicklow, Purchasers of.
Q. Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 4*, 391.

Ballaghamechan, Establishment of Parish Committee at, Reason for Delay in.
Q. Mr. P. A. McHugh; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 10*, 897.

Ballinasloe, *see that title.*

Ballyboy Farm—Right of Royal Artillery to Exercise on—Interference with Settlement of evicted Tenants.
Q. Mr. Cullinan; *A.* Mr. B. Davenport, *May 9*, 753-754.

Ballymahon Magisterial Bench, Appointing Roman Catholic to Vacancy on.
Q. Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 3*, 255-256.

Ballymena.
Telephone Extension, Cause of Delay in Commencing Works.
Q. Mr. O'Doherty; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Apr. 29*, 14-15.
Urban County District Order Presented, *May 6*, 635, 643.

Ballyvarley, Co. Down—Sunday Hurling Matches, Disturbances with regard to—Instituting Prosecutions.
Q. Mr. Macveagh; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 9*, 768-769.

Baltimore.
Harbour—Condition of Beacon.
Q. Mr. Gilhooly; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *May 2*, 125.
Postal Service—Affording Second Post.
Q. Mr. Gilhooly; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 3*, 262-263.

Banbridge, Co. Down, Disturbances at—Prosecution of Rioters, etc.
Q. Mr. Macveagh; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 9*, 773.
Qs. Mr. Macveagh, Mr. J. Redmond, Mr. T. W. Russell, Mr. S. O. Gore, Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 11*, 1019-1021.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 16*, 1392-1393.

Bangor Urban County Districts Order Presented, *May 6*, 635, 643.

Bank of, *see under* Banks.

Barrow River, Inspection of.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 13*, 1297.

Belturbet Post Office—New Building, Local Objection to—Reconsidering Plans.
Q. Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 3*, 262.

Bloomfield Estate, Sale of—Name of Owner, &c.
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 2*, 121.

[*cont.*

Ireland—*cont.*

Borrisoleigh Band, securing, from Police Interference—Relieving District from Burden of Extra Police, etc.
Q. Mr. P. J. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 16*, 1394–1395.

Boycotting, *see that title.*

Buncrana and Carndonagh Railway, Appointment of Arbitrators.
Q. Mr. O'Doherty; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Apr. 29*, 15.

Butter—Railway Rates to English Markets.
Q. Mr. Joyce; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 9*, 765.

Cahirciveen River—Placing Buoys and Perches in the Estuary, Authority responsible for.
Qs. Mr. Boland, Mr. Joyce, Mr. Flynn; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, Mr. Speaker, *May 16*, 1384-1385.

Carlow, Evicted Tenants in—Names of those making Applications for Restoration, etc.
Q. Mr. Hammond; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 12*, 1160.

Carndonagh—Railway to Buncrana—Appointment of Arbitrators.
Q. Mr. O'Doherty; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *April 29*, 15.

Carrickfergus, Sewage Nuisance near, steps to remedy.
Q. Col. McCalmont; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 9*. 747.

Castletown, Berehaven—Postal Arrangements—Granting improved Facilities.
Q. Mr. Gilhooly; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 5*, 519-520.

Census of 1901.
Index, General topographical, presented, *May 6*, 634, 643.
Occupations, Figures relating to.
Q. Mr. Toulmin; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *May 11*, 1009.

Clones Telegraph Examination—Reasons for appointment of unsuccessful candidate to post.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 16*, 1396.

Clonmany, Conveyance of Military Passengers to Leenan Fort from—Accepting Local Contract, etc.
Q. Mr. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *May 9*, 749.

Colclough Estate, Wexford, expediting Sale of, to Tenants.
Q. Mr. Ffrench; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 3*, 255.

Congested Districts, scheduling Districts as, Refusal of Applications for.
Q. Dr. Thompson; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 2*, 101-102.

Connemara, postal delays in.
O. Mr. O'Malley, *May 12*, 1266.

Constabulary, Royal Irish, *see that title.*

Ireland—*cont.*

Cooscroum Landing Place—Date of commencing work.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 5*, 540.

Cork, *see that title.*

Courtown Harbour, dredging entrance to.
Q. Sir T. Esmonde; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 9*, 763.
Additional Dredgers, providing.
Q. Sir T. Esmonde; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *May 12*, 1160.

County Court—Registrars, salaries, and fees of, Return ordered, *May 12*, 1005.

County Surveyors and County Secretary's Offices, Clerks in, Rules as to Pensions and Dismissal of.
Q. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 16*, 1372-1373.

Crimelessness of, as compared with England, Scotland, and Wales.
Os. Col. Saunderson, *Apr. 29*, 56; Mr. Boland, 461; Mr. H. Burke, 465, 466.

Crimes Act, *see that title.*

Crofton, Hugh, Estate of—stamped receipts for rent and ejectment costs, refusal of, alleged—Inquiry, etc.
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *May 2*, 123, 124.

Cullooney, Railway tickets not issued for, from Sligo, alleged.
Q. Mr. O'Dowd; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *May 2*, 124, 125.

Cummeen, granting increased Postal Facilities to.
Q. Mr. Murphy; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 16*, 1366-1367.

Cusack Estate, Longford—Progress of Sale—Return showing Names of intending Purchasers, etc.
Q. Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 4*, 388.

Derry Shipbuilding Yard, recommending, to a Share of Naval Work.
Q. Mr. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *May 12*, 1183–1184.

Development Fund, Items of Supplementary Estimate for—Date of tabling, etc.
Qs. Mr. J. Redmond, Mr. Kilbride; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 12*, 1173–1175.

Dingle and Tralee Railway, Development Fund Grant for.
Q. Mr. J. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 12*, 1173–1174.

Downpatrick, Training of 5th Battalion Royal Irish Rifles at.
Q. Mr. Wood; *A.* Mr. B. Davenport, *May 12*, 1184.

Dublin, *see that title.*

Dundrum.
Estate—Fair Rent Appeals, date of hearing.
Q. Mr. K. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 16*, 1386.

[*cont.*

Ireland—*cont.*

Dundrum—*cont.*

Petty Sessions—Appointing additional Magistrates.
Q. Mr. K. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 5*, 544.

Dunleary, old harbour of—Sale of portion of foreshore, minute presented, *May 4*, 372; *May 5*, 495.

Dunmanway Electoral Division—Dividing into two Divisions.
Q. Mr. E. Barry; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 5*, 532.

Edge Estate, Queen's County—Progress of Sale—Provision for Thos. M'Cormack.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 5*, 541.

Education, *see that title.*

Emigration Statistics—Connaught Statistics—Holding Committee of Inquiyr.
Q. Dr. Ambrose; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 3*, 252.

Enniskillen Urban County District, Order presented, *April 29*, 4, 11.

Evictions, *see that title.*

Fair Rent Appeals—Powerscourt Estate—Date of completing Cases.
Q. Mr. T. W. Russell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 12*, 1152.

Falchorrib Pier—Date of commencing Work.
Q. Mr. H. Law; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 3*, 253–254.

Farmers, Small, housing of—Making Provision in Labourers (Ireland) Bill.
Q. Mr. Sheehan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 11*, 1017.

Fermanagh, abolishing Police Stations in certain Rural Districts of.
Q. Mr. Jordan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 12*, 1182.

Ferns Postmaster—Appointment of Liverpool Town Postman—Qualifications for Post, etc.
Q. Sir T. Esmonde; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 12*, 1153–1154.

Fisheries.

Close Season off the Donegal Coast, extending Area affected.
Q. Mr. O'Doherty; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Apr. 29*, 16.

Fishermen, Inclusion of, in benefits of Labourers Acts, proposed.
Qs. Mr. Sheehan; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 10*, 894, 895.

Fishguard and Rosslare Railway, Negotiations concerning.
Q. Mr. J. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 12*, 1174–1175.

Florence Knox Estate, Mayo—Purchase of untenanted Lands by Estates Commissioners.
Q. Mr. O'Dowd; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 9*, 767.

Ireland—*cont.*

Galbraith Estate, Co. Tyrone—Purchase by Commissioners—considering Tenants' Applications.
Q. Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 4*, 393-394.

Galloway Bulls, Purchase of, under Agricultural Department's Live Stock Schemes.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 4*, 390-391.

Galway, extra Police Charges in—Distinguishing from the case of Armagh.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 16*, 1374.

Garrisons in, Military Stores for—Contract Value of Saddlery, etc., supplied by Woolwich, 1900-1903.
Q. Mr. Nannetti; *A.* Mr. B. Davenport, *May 9*, 754-755.

Garryhinch Estate, Queen's Co., Date of placing in Land Judge's Court—Steps to effect a Sale.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 9*, 764.

Gortnasate Pier—Date of commencing work.
Q. Mr. H. Law; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 3*, 253-254.

Granard Workhouse—Dismissal of Master—Reasons, etc.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 16*, 1385-1386.

Gun Licences—Martin Jennings, Reason for Depriving of Gun, etc.
Q. Mr. Roche; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 11*, 1021.

Home Rule, Granting, proposed.
Os. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 4*, 477; Mr. J. Redmond, 485.

Housing of the Working Classes, *see under* Housing, etc.

Irish Guards, *see under* Army.

Irish Language, *see that title.*

Irish Society of London—Receipts and Expenditure, Yearly, 1882 to 1904—Granting Return.
Q. Mr. O'Doherty; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 12*, 1159–1160.

Island Bridge Barracks Workshops, Closing of—Expenditure on imported Carts and Wagons 1900–1903.
Q. Mr. Nannetti; *A.* Mr. B. Davenport, *May 9*, 754.

Kenmare.

Bay, Erection of Gas buoy on the Maiden, proposed.
O. Mr. Joyce, *May 13*, 1310.

Estate—Proposed Sale by Townlands—Power of Commissioners to sanction Sale.
Q. Mr. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 12*, 1179.

Kerry, Evicted Tenants in—Number of, and of Restorations under Land Act, 1903.
Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 12*, 1175–1176.

[*cont.*

Ireland—*cont.*

Kilkee, Sanitary Authority for—Appointment of Officers.
Q. Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 12*, 1160-1161.

Kilkeel Petty Sessions — Difficulty in obtaining Evidence of Dispensary Doctor—Adjournment of Case.
Q. Mr. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 9*, 770-771.

Killanin, Lord, Property of—Purchase by Tenants—Acquiring Grazing Farm to enlarge Holdings.
Q. Mr. Roche; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May* 9, 764-765.

Kilrush Postmastership — Applications from Members of Irish Service, etc.
Q. Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 13*, 1294.

Kingston Estate, Cork, Sale of, to Tenants —Terms of Sale—Instituting Inquiry, etc.
Qs. Mr. W. Abraham, Mr. Lundon, Capt. Donelan, Mr. Murphy; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 11*, 1023-1024.

Knocknagoshel, Co. Kerry, Sunday Postal Delivery at.
Q. Mr. Murphy; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 9*, 774-775.

Labourers Acts—Inclusion of Fishermen proposed.
Qs. Mr. Sheehan; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 10*, 894, 895.

Land Commission, *see that title.*

Land Purchase, *see that title.*

Landlords of Small Holdings—Liability for Rates—Proposed Amendment of Local Government Act.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 12*, 1161-1162.

Law Officers of the Crown—Fees and Salaries.
Q. Mr. Whitley; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *May 5*, 522.

Law and Justice, Administration of.
Os. Mr. Boland, *May 4*, 461; Mr. W. Moore, 468; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 475, 476; Mr. Wyndham, 480.

Leamyglissane, Arranging for Daily Postal Delivery at.
Q. Mr. Murphy; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 16*, 1366-1367.

Lights and Lighthouses, *see that title.*

Limavady, Telephone Extension from Ballymena to, Cause of Delay in commencing Works.
Q. Mr. O'Doherty; *A.* Lord Stanley, *April 29*, 14-15.

Limerick Lighthouse, Application for, ignored by the Lights Board.
O. Mr. Joyce, *May 13*, 1310.

Lisburn Hurling Matches, Disturbances with regard to.
Q. Mr. J. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 9*, 769-770.

Ireland—*cont.*

Local Government Board—Annual Report, Date of tabling, etc.
Q. Mr. Sheehan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 12*, 1179-1180.

Local Loans—Rate of Interest—Reverting to former Rate.
Q. Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *May 3*, 258-259.

Londonderry, *see that title.*

Longford, *see that title.*

Magillan Camp, Opening Telegraph Office at, etc.
Q. Mr. Nannetti; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 11*, 1006-1007.

Mallow Recreation Ground—Reason for refusing Provisional Order to acquire Land.
Q. Mr. W. Abraham; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 12*, 1178-1179.

Meath Hospital—Medical Staff—Election to Vacancies.
Q. Mr. Clancy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 6*, 644.

Military Works Department—Employment of Civilian Engineers.
Q. Mr. Sullivan; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *May 3*, 245.

Motor Car Services, Date of Starting.
Q. Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 3*, 254.

Mount Bellew—National School built by Private Effort—Sanctioning Expenditure for Technical Instruction.
Q. Mr. Roche; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 12*, 1177-1178.

Mount Shannon Estate, Purchase of, to enlarge adjoining Holdings.
Q. Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Wyndham; *May 9*, 747-748

Moy, co. Tyrone—Restoring Morning Mail Service.
Q. Mr. T. W. Russell; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 5*, 520.

Munster Dairy School, Allocation of Grant for.
Q. Mr. Flynn; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 4*, 394.

National Bank—Receivable Order under Land Purchase Act, 1903—Form proposed.
Q. Sir T. Esmonde; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 11*, 1011.

Neagh, Lough, Drainage of — Engineer's Report, Publication of, etc.
Q. Mr. C. Craig; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 16*, 1387.

Pallaskenry, Alleged offensive Notice exhibited in—Steps to prevent Exhibition, etc.
Q. Mr. O'Shaughnessy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 9*, 770.
Qs. Mr. O'Shaughnessy, Mr. Joyce, Mr. Lundon; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 11*, 1026.

[*cont.*

Ireland—*cont.*

Paupers, Deportation of, from England—
Case of Frank Milner.
Qs. Mr. Delany; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 10*, 896, 897; *May 12*, 1178.

Piers and Harbours, *see that title.*

Police, *see* Constabulary, Royal Irish.

Poor Law.
Medical Officers, Commission to investigate Grievances.
Q. Dr. Thompson; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Apr. 29*, 12–13.
Outdoor Relief, refusal of Local Government Board to sanction at Thurles, alleged.
Q. Mr. K. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 2*, 122, 123.

Post Office, *see* Post Office—Ireland.

Powerscourt Estate—Fair-Rent Appeals—Date of completing cases.
Q. Mr. T. W. Russell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 12*, 1152.

Queenstown, American Mail landed at, Sorting of, etc.
Qs. Mr. Nannetti, Capt. Donelan; *As.* Lord Stanley, *May 3*, 259–260.

Railways, *see* Railways—Ireland.

Riot Act, Application of, to Ireland.
Os. Mr. H. Burke, *May 4*, 465; Mr. W. Moore, 467.

Rockfield Estate, co. Kerry, Sale of—Forcing Terms on Tenants, etc.
Q. Mr. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 5*, 543.

Roscommon Quarter Sessions—Notifying Jurors in the Absence of Criminal Business.
Q. Mr. Hayden; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 3*, 252.

Rosbeg—Additional Landing for Fishing Boats, Provision of.
Q. Mr. H. Law; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 3*, 254.

Rosslare and Fishguard Railway, Negotiations concerning.
Q. Mr. J. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 12*, 1174–1175.

Rowe Estate, Sale of—Delay in Land Judge's Court, etc.
Qs. Mr. Ffrench; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 2*, 122; *May 4*, 391.
Q. Mr. T. W. Russell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 4*, 391

Royal University—Statutes, Alteration of—Royal Warrant of approval presented, *May 2*, 76, 91.

St. Louis Exhibition, Exhibits at.
Q. Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 4*, 388–389.

Ireland—*cont*

St. Patrick's Training College—Delay in awarding Teaching Diplomas.
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 12*, 1161.

Stewart Estate, co. Tyrone — Sale to Tenants—Progress made.
Q. Mr. Murnaghan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 5*, 530.

Street Betting Bill, Application of, to Ireland, proposed.
O. Lord Davey, *May 10*, 876.

Tarbet to Kilrush Tourist Steamers—Government Subsidy.
Q. Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 3*, 254–255.

Telephone Service, Londonderry and Limavady Extension, Cause of Delay in commencing Works.
Q. Mr. O'Doherty; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Apr. 29*, 14–15.

Templetown, Providing increased Postal Facilities for.
Q. Mr. Ffrench; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 3*, 261–262.

Thurles Union—Poor Law outdoor relief, refusal of Local Government Board to sanction, alleged.
Q. Mr. K. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 2*, 122, 123.

Tipperary—Local Government Surcharges, Enforcing.
Q. Mr. Cullinan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 5*, 540–541.

Tralee, Extending Trunk Telephone System to.
Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 16*, 1367.

Tralee and Dingle Railway, Development Fund Grant for.
Q. Mr. J. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 12*, 1173–1174.

Tredinnick Estate, Expediting sale of.
Q. Mr. Hayden; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 16*, 1389, 1390.

Trinity College Lands — Commission of Inquiry into Sale—Terms of Reference.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 4*, 389–390.

Tuam—District Nurse O'Connor, Augmenting Salary of.
Q. Mr. Reddy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 4*, 389.

Tullaghan, Establishment of Parish Committee at, Reason for delay in.
Q. Mr. P. A. McHugh; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 10*, 897.

Turf, Thefts of, from Kellysgrove Bog—Excessive Sentence imposed at Ballinasloe Petty Sessions Court.
Q. Mr. Roche; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 12*, 1177.

[*cont.*

Ireland—*cont.*
United Irish League, Resolution of, to compel sales by landlords before May rents become due, alleged.
Os. Lord Muskerry, *May 10*, 876; Earl of Denbigh, 877; Lord Clonbrock, 877; Earl of Cork, 878.
Vagrancy, Inquiry into—Vice-regal Commission on Poor Laws, Terms of reference of, etc.
Q. Mr. H. Law; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 10*, 895, 896.
Valentia Harbour, Telegraph Office at, Continuing, during the Fishery Season.
Qs. Mr. Boland, Mr. Flavin; *As.* Lord Stanley, *May 12*, 1183.
Waterford.
Bridge, New, at—Estimated Cost—Government and Local Contributions.
Q. Mr. W. Moore; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 13*, 1297.
Evicted Tenants in—Applications for Re-instatement–Granting Return.
Q. Mr. Power; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 5*, 531-532.
Weir Estate, Sligo, Administration of—Sale of Knocalassa Grazing Farm.
Q. Mr. O'Dowd; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 9*, 766-767.
Westmeath Quarter Sessions—Notifying Jurors in the Absence of Criminal Business.
Q. Mr. Sullivan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 5*, 542-543.
Whiskey, Tax on—Burden imposed on Ireland.
Os. Mr. Flynn, *May 3*, 342; Mr. J. F. Hope, 347.
Workhouses.
Armagh—Master's Salary—Reason for raising, etc.
Q. Mr. J. Campbell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 5*, 542.
Granard — Dismissal of Master — Reasons, etc.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 16*, 1385-1386.
Hospitals of—Military Patients, Obligation to admit.
Q. Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 3*, 256.
Works, Board of, Act establishing, Money spent by, etc.
Q. Sir T. Esmonde; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *Apr. 29*, 15-16.

Irish Language
Dictionary of—Progress of Work—Expenditure.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *May 3*, 258.
Post Office Officials, Requiring knowledge by, in Ireland.
Qs. Mr. Boland; *As.* Lord Stanley, *May 3*, 260-261.

Irish Language—*cont.*
Teaching of—Including as Optional Subject in the Code.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *May 3*, 257-258.

Irish Rifles, Royal, 5th Battalion
Training at Downpatrick.
Q. Mr. Wood; *A.* Mr. B. Davenport, *May 12*, 1184.

Irish Society of London
Receipts and Expenditure, Yearly, 1882 to 1904—Granting Return.
Q. Mr. O'Doherty; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 12*, 1159-1160.

Island Bridge Barracks
Workshop, Closing of—Amount expended on Importation of Carts and Wagons, 1900-1903, etc.
Q. Mr. Nannetti; *A.* Mr. B. Davenport, *May 9*, 754.

"Jackal," H.M.S.
Police Duties of—Absence on Research Work—Appointing Substitute.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *May 16*, 1377.

Jamaica
Matches, Excise duty on,
Q. Mr. McKenna; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 2*, 108, 109.

James of Hereford, Lord
Street Betting Bill, *Com.*, *May 10*, 868.

Jameson, Major T. E. [Clare, West]
Church of England Temperance Society, Circular of, Introduction of King's name into—Breach of privilege, alleged, *May 9*, 776, 777.
Licensing Bill, 2R., *May 9*, 847.
Charges, Imposition and Collection of, *May 9*, 740-741.
Lighthouses—Wireless Telegraphy, Delay in adoption of, *May 13*, 1343.
Lightships—Certificates of Keepers, Instructions in the event of Drifting, etc., *May 10*, 886.
Merchant Shipping (Lighthouses) Bill, 2R., *May 13*, 1340.
Tobacco Duties, Increase in—Allegations against Mr. Gallagher, *May 3*, 317.

Jameson Raid
Indemnity for—Claim against Chartered Company.
Q. Mr. Pirie; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 3*, 245-246.

Japan
Parcel Post rates to, Reduction of.
Q. Mr. Toulmin; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 11*, 1007.
War with Russia, *see* Russo-Japanese War.

Jeffreys, Rt. Hon. A. F.—*Deputy Chairman of Committees.*
  Milwr & District Mines Drainage Bill, Instruc. to Com., *May 12*, 1244.

Johnstone, Mr. J. H. [Sussex, Horsham]
  Local Government (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill, 2R., *Apr. 29*, 67.

Joicey, Sir J. [Durham, Chester-le-Street]
  Merchant Shipping (Lighthouses) Bill, 2R., *May 13*, 1335.
  Unclaimed dividends on Government Stock, appropriation of, to pay off Budget deficit, *May 3*, 361.

Jones, Mr. D. B. [Swansea District]
  Bishoprics of Southwark and Birmingham Bill, 2R., *May 4*, 407.
  County Courts—Judges' Deputies, relieving Judges from Expense of providing, *May 6*, 644.
  Ritualistic Practices.
    Growth of, *May 4*, 409.
    'oyal Commission on — Terms of Reference, *May 3*, 265.

Jordan, Mr. J. [Fermanagh, S.]
  Belcoo Constabulary discharging Duties of neighbouring Stations, *May 16*, 1390.
  Fermanagh—Abolishing Police Stations in certain Rural Districts, *May 12*, 1182.
  Railways—Great Northern Trains, lack of Sanitary Accommodation on, *May 16*, 1395.
  Registration of Clubs (Ireland) Bill, 2R. *May 6*, 665.

Journals of the House of Lords
  Committee.
    Report presented, *May 5*, 494.

Joyce, Mr. M. [Limerick]
  Agricultural Directory, Consulting Local Technical Committees as to, *May 9*, 769.
  Butter, Irish—Railway Rates to English Markets, *May 9*, 765.
  Cahirciveen, River, Responsibility for placing Buoys and Perches in Estuary of, *May 16*, 1385.
  Kenmare Bay, Erection of Gas Buoy on the Maiden, proposed, *May 13*, 1310.
  Limerick Lighthouse, Application for, ignored by the Lights Board, *May 13*, 1310.
  Merchant Shipping (Lighthouses) Bill, 2R., *May 13*, 1309.
  Navy Pensions—John Lawlor, Suggested Increase for, *May 11*, 1006.
  Ballaskenry, alleged Offensive Notice Exhibited in—Taking Steps to prevent, *May 11*, 1026.

Joyce Green Smallpox Hospital
  Dogs, Inoculation of, with Smallpox Virus.
    Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *May 10*, 893.

Kenmare
  Maiden Rock, erection of gas buoy on, proposed.
    O. Mr. Joyce, *May 13*, 1310.

Kenmare Estate
  Sale by Townlands proposed—Power of Commissioners to Sanction Sale.
    Q. Mr. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 12*, 1179.

Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir J. H. [Devonshire, Honiton]
  Licensing Bill, 2R., *May 11*, 1060.

Kent and East Sussex Light Railway (General Powers) Order, 1904
  Presented, *May 13*, 1272.

Kent Water Company
  Darenth, Well at, Liability of, to Pollution —Instituting Inquiry.
    Q. Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *May 12*, 1171.

Kenyon, Mr. G. T. [Denbigh]
  Education — National Council—Approval of Scheme by the Board — Tabling Copy, etc., *May 5*, 539.

Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. [Shropshire, Newport]
  Local Government (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill, 2R., *Apr. 29*, 34.
  Milwr and District Mines Drainage Bill, 2R., *May 9*, 838.

Kerry
  Evicted Tenants in—Number of, and of Restorations under Land Act, 1903.
    Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 12*, 1175-1176.

Kettering Improvement Bill
  l. Rep.* *May 3*, 221.
    3R.* *May 6*, 633.
  c. Lords' Amendments Considered and Agreed to * *May 12*, 1146.

Kew Gardens
  Lot's Eyot Facing Entrance to—Proposed Construction of Barge Dock, Making Protest against.
    Q. Mr. Skewes-Cox; *A.* Mr. A. Fellowes, *May 12*, 1156.

Kilbride, Mr. D. [Kildare, S.]
  Dredger, Provision of, from Development Fund Grant, *May 12*, 1175.
  Drogheda, Marquess of, Kildare Property of—Sale to Tenants—Re-instatement of Evicted Tenants, *May 12*, 1181-1182.

Kildare
Drogheda, Marquess of, Property of—Sale to Tenants—Re-instatement of Evicted Tenants.
Q. Mr. Kilbride; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 12*, 1181–1182.

Kilkee
Sanitary Authority for—Appointment of Officers.
Q. Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 12*, 1160–1161.

Kilkeel, Co. Down
Petty Sessions—Difficulty in obtaining Evidence of Dispensary Doctor—Adjournment of Case.
Q. Mr. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 9*, 770–771.

Killanin, Lord
Property of—Purchase by Tenants—Acquiring Grazing Farm to enlarge Holdings.
Q. Mr. Roche; *A.* Mr. Wyndham. *May 9*, 764–765.

Kilrush
Postmastership—Applications from Members of Irish Service, etc.
Q. Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 13*, 1294.

Kimber, Mr. H. [Wandsworth]
Bishoprics of Southwark and Birmingham Bill, 2R., *May 4*, 425.

King, Sir H. S. [Hull, Central]
Tea, Adulteration of—Excluding Imports of Impure Tea, *May 2*, 101.

Kingston Estate, Cork
Sale to Tenants—Terms of Sale—Instituting Inquiry, etc.
Qs. Mr. W. Abraham, Mr. Lundon, Capt. Donelan, Mr. Murphy; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 11*, 1023–1024.

Kirkby-in-Ashfield Urban District Gas Bill
l. Rep.* *May 3*, 221.

Knocknagoshel, Co. Kerry
Sunday Postal Delivery at.
Q. Mr. Murphy; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May* 9, 774–775.

Knowles, Sir L. [Salford, W.]
Bishoprics of Southwark and Birmingham Bill, 2R., *May 4*, 406.

Labouchere, Mr. H. [Northampton]
Athanasian Creed, Changes made in, by Convocation, *May 11*, 1008.

Labourers' Cottages, Ireland
Expense, Cheapening of, under Labourers (Ireland) Bill.
Q. Mr. O'Shaughnessy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 4*, 392.

Labourers' Cottages, Ireland—*cont.*
Return, Cause of Delay in Publication of.
Q. Mr. O'Shaughnessy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 16*, 1388.

Labourers (Ireland) Acts
Unexpended Balance of Exchequer Contribution, Application of.
Q. Mr. O'Dowd; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 9*, 766.

Labourers (Ireland) Bill
Costs in connection with Cottage Schemes—Inserting Compensation Clause.
Q. Mr. O'Shaughnessy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 4*, 392–393.
Cottage Scheme, Expense of, Under.
Q. Mr. Shaughnessy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 4*, 392.
Date of Second Reading.
Q. Mr. J. Redmond; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *May 12*, 1184.
Housing—Introducing Provisions.
Q. Mr. Sheehan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 11*, 1017.
Maximum Rating Limit, Question of increasing—Application of Unexpended Balance of Exchequer Contribution.
Q. Mr. O'Shaughnessy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 4*, 392.

Lambert, Mr. G. [Devonshire, South Molton]
Licensed Premises.
Death Duty—Average Number of Years Purchase of Licence Value charged, *May 4*, 383.
Valuation for Estate Duty, *May 2*, 111.
Somaliland Campaign.
Cost, Total, Including Estimate for 1904, *May 12*, 1162.
Cost prior to 1st October, 1902, *May 13*, 1296.
Mijertain Tribe.
Mullah attacked by, *May 2*, 109, 110.
Strength of—Strength of Mullah's Forces, *May 4*, 383.
Mullah, Position of—Rifles and Ammunition captured, etc., *May 12*, 1169–1170.
Tibet Expedition.
Chinese Amban and Tibetan Representative, Authority of, *May 4*, 382.
Expenditure incurred—Estimated Cost of Advance to Lhasa—Number of Troops to be employed, *May 13*, 1296.
Lhasa, Advance to.
Date of—Location of Chinese Amban—Character of Chinese Suzerainty, *May 16*, 1380.
Discussion of, Fixing Date for, *May 12*, 1187.

Lambert, Mr. G.—*cont.*
Tibet Expedition—*cont.*.
Progress of—Guarding Lines of Communication, etc., *May 12*, 1168.
Recognition of, by Dalai Lama, *May 2*, 109.
Strength of, &c., *May 16*, 1379.

Lancashire & Yorkshire Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill
*c. con.** *May 2*, 86.
3R.* *May 5*, 515.
l. 2R.* *May 16*, 1357.

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway (Various Powers) Bill
*c. con.** *May 12*, 1146.
3R.* *May 16*, 1361.

Lancashire Electric Power Bill
c. 1R.* *Apr. 29*, 10.
2R.* *May 9*, 736.

Lancaster, County of
Charities, Inquiry into.
Return presented, *May 12*, 1004.

Lancaster, Duchy of
Chancellor—Sir W. H. Walrond.

Land Act (1903) Ireland
Amendment Bill—Date of Second Reading.
Q. Mr, J. Redmond ; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *May 12*, 1184.

Land Commission (Ireland)
Assistant Commissioners,
Rules as to, presented, *May 10*, 867, 885.
Commissioner acting in a District in which he has Personal Interests, Regulations as to—Case of Mr. G. Bolster.
Q. Mr. Flynn ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham. *May 16*, 1373–1374.
Fair Rent Appeals—Ravenscourt Estate—Date of completing Cases.
Q. Mr. T. W. Russell ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 12*, 1152.
Head Rents, Redemption of, Average Number of years Purchase fixed for.
Q. Mr. Flavin ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 12*, 1180–1181.
Report, Annual—Date of Publication—Including Report from Estates Commissioners.
Qs. Mr. J. Redmond, Mr. T. W. Russell ; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 9*, 771–772.
Rules presented, *May 2*, 91 ; *May 3*, 223, 238.

Land Drainage Provisional Order Bill
c. 1R.* *May 5*, 515.

Land Judge's Court
Encumbered Estate—Inspection procedure under the Act.
Qs. Mr. O'Dowd, Mr. T. W. Russell ; *As.* Mr. Atkinson, *May 2*, 120.

Land Judge's Court—*cont.*
Garryhinch Estate, Queen's Co., Date of placing in—Steps to effect a Sale.
Q. Mr. Delany ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 4*, 764.
Procedure, Delay, etc. — Sale of Rowe Estate.
Q. Mr. Ffrench ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 2*, 122.

Land Purchase, Ireland
Achonry Estate, Sale of, to Congested Districts Board.
Q. Mr. O'Dowd ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 2*, 121, 122.
Avondale Estate, Wicklow, Purchasers of.
Q. Mr. J. O'Connor ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 4*, 391.
Bank of Ireland—Monopoly of Accounts connected with Act of 1903—Protests from Joint Stock Banks—Placing all Banks on the same footing, etc.
Q. Mr. W. Moore ; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *May 9*, 746–747.
Bloomfield Estate, Sale of — Name of owner, etc.
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 2*, 121.
Colclough Estate, Wexford, Expediting Sale of, to Tenants.
Q. Mr. Ffrench ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 3*, 255.
Cusack Estate, Longford — Progress of Sale—Return showing Names of intending Purchasers, etc.
Q. Mr. J. P. Farrell ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 4*, 388.
Edge Estate, Queen's Co. — Progress of Sale—Provision for Thos. M'Cormack.
Q. Mr. Delany ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 5*, 541.
Encumbered Estates, Procedure for inspection of, etc., under Act.
Qs. Mr. O'Dowd, Mr. T. W. Russell ; *As.* Mr, Atkinson, *May 2*, 120.
Estates Commissioners' Rules, Tabling.
Qs. Mr, P. A. M'Hugh, Mr. Flynn ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 5*, 541–542.
Florence Knox Estate, Mayo—Purchase of Untenanted Lands by the Commissioners.
Q. Mr. O'Dowd ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 9*, 767.
Future Tenants, Purchase of Holdings by—Remedy against exorbitant demands.
Qs. Mr. Sheehy, Mr. Flavin ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 9*, 763.
Galbraith Estate, Co. Tyrone—Purchase by Commissioners—Considering Tenants' application.
Q. Mr. J. P. Farrell ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 4*, 393–394.
Kenmare Estate—Proposed Sale by Townlands — Power of Commissioners to sanction Scheme.
Q. Mr. Murphy ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 12*, 1179.

[*cont.*

Land Purchase, Ireland—*cont.*

Kildare Property of the Marquess of Drogheda — Sale to Tenants — Reinstatement of Evicted Tenants.
  Q. Mr. Kilbride; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 12*, 1181-1182.

Killanin, Lord, Property of—Purchase by Tenants—Acquiring Grazing Farm to enlarge Holdings.
  Q. Mr. Roche; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 9*, 764-765.

Kingston Estate, Cork—Sale to Tenants—Terms of Sale—Instituting Inquiry, etc.
  Qs. Mr. W. Abraham, Mr. Lundon, Capt. Donelan, Mr. Murphy; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 11*, 1023-1024.

Mount Shannon Estate, Purchase of, to enlarge adjoining Holdings.
  Q. Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 9*, 747-748.

National Bank—Receivable Order under the Act of 1903—Form proposed.
  Q. Sir T. Esmonde; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 11*, 1011.

Report, Annual, of Commissioners, 1903-4—Date of Publication, etc.
  Qs. Mr. Ffrench, Mr. J. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May* 3, 256, 257.

Rockfield Estate, co. Kerry, Sale of—Forcing Terms on Tenants, etc.
  Q. Mr. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 5*, 543.

Rowe Estate—Delay in Land Judge's Court, etc.
  Q. Mr. Ffrench; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 2*. 122.
  Qs. Mr. Ffrench, Mr. T. W. Russell; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 4*,391.

Stewart Estate, co. Tyrone — Sale to Tenants—Progress made.
  Q. Mr. Murnaghan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 5*, 530.

Tredinnick Estate, Roscommon, expediting Sale of.
  Q. Mr. Hayden; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 16*, 1389-1390.

Trinity College Lands—Commission of Inquiry into Sale—Terms of Reference.
  Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 4*, 389-390.

United Irish League, Resolution of, to compel Sales by Landlords before May rents become due, alleged.
  Os. Lord Muskerry, *May 10*, 876; Earl of Denbigh, Lord Clonbrock, 877; Earl of Cork, 878.

Untenanted Lands, Division of, by Commissioners—Treatment of Herds.
  Q. Mr. Hayden; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 9*, 765-766.

Land Purchase, Ireland—*cont.*

Weir Estate, Sligo, Administration of—Sale of Knocalassa Grazing Farm.
  Q. Mr. O'Dowd; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 9*, 766-767.

Lansdowne, Marquess of [*Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs*]

Light Load Line—Failure of Board of Trade to carry out recommendations of Select Committee, *May 2*, 84.

Macedonian Crisis—Progress made in reforms, etc., *May 5*, 508.

Peers, Roll of, presentation of, at beginning of each Session, proposed, *May 13*, 1288.

Salisbury, Late Marquess of, erection of Statue of, proposed, *May 13*, 1289.

Street Betting Bill, *Com.*, *May 10*, 869, 874.

Whitsuntide Recess, Adjournment for, *May 6*, 637.

Law, Mr. H. A. [Donegal W.]

Falchorrib and Gortnasate Piers—Dates of Commencing Works, *May 3*, 253.

Macedonia — Conference of Insurgent Leaders — Steps to reassure the populace, *May 3*, 247.

Registration of Clubs (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *May 6*, 663.

Rossbeg Landing Accommodation, providing additional, *May 3*, 254.

Vagrancy in Ireland, Inquiry into, proposed, *May 10*, 895.

Law Courts

Scotland--Lack of Accommodation—delay in carrying out enlargements.
  O. Mr. Ure, *May 5*, 565.

Law Officers of the Crown

Fees and Salaries of English and Irish.
  Q. Mr. Whitley; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *May 5*, 522.

Laws

Temporary.
  Register of, presented, *May 5*, 519.

Lawson Mr. J. G.—*Secretary to the Local Government Board* [York, N.R., Thirsk]

Tuberculosis, Bovine—Report of Royal Commission—Date of Issue, etc., *May 11*, 1017.

Lawson, Sir W. [Cornwall, Camborne]

Licensing Bill, 2R., *May 10*, 937, 981, *May 11*, 1067.

Leamyglissane

Postal Service at—Arranging for Daily Delivery.
  Q. Mr. Murphy; *A.* Lord Stanley *May 16*, 1366-1367.

Lee, Mr. A. H. [Hampshire, Fareham]

Reserve Battery, establishing at Fraserburgh, *May 2*, 102-103.

Lee, River

Fish in, Poisoning of, by Outflow from Waltham Abbey Ordnance Factory—Steps to be taken.
    Q. Col. Lockwood ; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *May 16*, 1374–1375.

Leeds Corporation (Waterworks) Railway Bill

l. Report from Select Committee, *Apr. 29*, 2.
    3R.* *May 3*, 222.
c. 1R.* *May 5*, 517.
    2R.* *May 16*, 1361.

Lees, Sir E. [Birkenhead]

Parliamentary Elections—Absentee Electors, Arranging to record Votes of, *May 9*, 775.

Leicestershire and Warwickshire Electric Power Bill

l. Rep.* *May 5*, 493.
    3R.* *May 10*, 866.
c. 1R.* *May 13*, 1291.

Leng, Sir J. [Dundee]

Licensing Bill—Extending Provisions to other parts of United Kingdom, *May 9*, 775.

Merchant Shipping (Lighthouses) Bill, 2R., *May 13*, 1315.

Navy—Submarine A.1., Loss of—Cost of Salvage Operations—Result from Pneumatic System, *May 2*, 97.

Patents, British, Compulsory Licences for—Total Number, etc., *May 3*, 241.

Post Office.

    Australia, Penny Post to, Negotiations as to, *May 12*, 1228.

    Canada, Facilitating Postage of Newspapers to, proposed, *May 12*, 1228.

    Dundee Deliverers, Grievances of—Delay in Reply to Memorial regarding, *May 12*, 1229.

    Learners.

        Female—Appointment of, on the Establishment, *May 2*, 92.

        Remuneration and Promotion of, *May 12*, 1229,

St. James' Park, Removal of Pathway at west end of Ornamental Water in, *May 10*, 887.

Transvaal, Importation of Chinese Labour. Chinese Government, Position of, Negotiations with, *May 12*, 1164.

    Convention, Signing of, *May 12*, 1165.

Unclaimed Dividends on Government Stock, Appropriation of, to pay off Budget deficit, *May 3*, 361.

Letters

see under Post Office.

Leveson-Gower, Mr. F. S. [Sutherland]

Crofters and Cottars, Scotland.

    Co operation among, Encouragement of, proposed, *May 5*, 579.

    Seed, Distribution of, among, *May 5*, 579.

Telegraph Service, Scotland—Night Messengers, Salary and Pension of, *May 4*, 373.

Levy, Mr. M. [Leicestershire, Loughborough]

Unclaimed Dividends on Government Stock, Appropriation of, to pay off Budget deficit, *May 3*, 362.

Lewis, Island of

Barvas, Destitution in, consequent on Failure of Crops—Relief Works, proposed.
    Q. Mr. Weir ; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *May 2*, 119.

Carloway and Stornoway, Road between—Date of Completion.
    O. Mr. Weir, *May 5*, 585.

Crosbost, Burying Ground of—Acquisition of new ground.
    Q. Mr. Weir ; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *May 2*, 118, 119.

Equivalent Grant, Allocation of—Maintenance of Footpaths and Bridges, etc.
    Q. Mr. Weir ; *A.* Mr. S. Dickson, *May 12*, 1172–1173.

Gravir and Cromore, Road between, Cost of, Inefficiency of Government Survey, etc.
    O. Mr. Weir, *May 5*, 562.

Holdings for Crofters—Necessity for Purchase of Land.
    O. Mr. Weir, *May 5*, 584.

Lewis, Mr. J. H. [Flint Boroughs]

Education—Wales and Monmouthshire, Population of each Local Authority, *May 6*, 647.

Income Tax Abatements — Estimated Total Amount liable to be paid for Year 1903–4, *May 12*, 1171.

Milwr and District Mines Drainage Bill, 2R. *May 9*, 840.

Navy—Warlike Stores remaining in hand 31st March, 1880, 1890, 1900 and 1903, Value of, *May 12*, 1165.

Ley's Charity

Representation of Parish of Combe Martin.
    Q. Mr. Soares ; *A.* Mr. G. Boscawen, *May 5*, 521–522.

Lhasa

see under Tibet Expedition.

Licences

Compulsory, for British Patents—Total Number, etc.
    Q. Sir J. Leng ; *A.* G. Balfour, *May 3*, 241.

[*cont.*

Licences—*cont.*

Dogs, for Keeping — Fines, Average Amount of, Number of Persons Fined, etc.
Qs. Mr. Weir; *As.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *May 10*, 891.

Gun—Ireland—M. Jennings, Reason for Depriving of Gun, etc.
Q. Mr. Roche; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 11*, 1621.

Liquor Licences, *see under* Liquor Licensing, etc.

Omnibus Drivers and Conductors, of—Suspension by Police Authority.
Q. Mr. Lough; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *May 3*, 240.

Licensed Premises
see under Liquor Licensing, etc.

Licensing Bill
c. 2R. *May 9*, 778; *May 10*, 899; *May 11*, 1033.

Debates on Second Reading [Commons] *May 9*, 778; *May 10*, 899; *May 11*, 1033.

Anomalies of the Bill, 795, 796, 920.

Ante-1869 Beer-houses, Position of, 801, 911, 912, 915, 936, 955, 1053, 1072.

Breach of Faith with the Public on the Part of the Trade, alleged, 947, 948, 1092.

Brewers, Enormous Profits made by—Proportion of Taxation Paid, etc., 811, 1043.

Brewster Sessions—Action of Magistrates in Forcibly Reducing Licences, 916–918, 927, 929, 930, 961, 962, 964, 965, 972, 976, 977, 978, 1034, 1047, 1083.

Bruce, Mr., Bill of, in 1874, 788, 1044, 1090.

Compensation.

Ante-1869 Beerhouses, claims of, 911, 912, 936, 1053.

Basis for Granting, 795, 819, 820, 828, 857, 862, 900, 906, 921, 933, 957, 990, 1055, 1065.

Borrowings on Fund, Powers as to, and Objections to, 959.

Class of Houses likely to be forcibly Closed, 791, 800, 801, 822, 852, 912, 971.

Definition of, 902, 926, 1077.

Insurance Fund to be Raised by the Trade for Purposes of—Scale of Amounts to be Contributed, etc., 790, 791, 794, 795, 800, 807, 809, 819, 825, 846, 900, 904, 932, 941, 959, 960, 962, 1057, 1080.

Monopoly Value of New Licences to go into the Fund, alleged, 1051, 1052, 1058.

Licensing Bill—*cont.*

Debate on Second Reading—cont.

Compensation—*cont.*

Necessity for Granting, and Advantages of, 782, 783, 789, 798, 799, 803, 823, 824, 845, 864, 908, 909, 914, 928–930, 936–938, 952, 953, 966, 969, 981, 983, 988, 989, 995, 999, 1039, 1041, 1045, 1052.

Number of Reductions that could be Effected with the Amount Available for, 781, 790, 800, 803, 804, 817, 818, 830, 832, 905, 954, 966, 983, 994, 1040, 1061, 1080.

Public would be made to Pay by the Trade, alleged, 809, 810.

Quarter Sessions, Power of, to fix Levy, or Apportion, 814, 922, 935, 942, 990.

Recommendations of Majority and Minority Reports of Royal Commission as to, 803, 830, 939, 958.

Tenants Excluded from all Benefit, alleged, 808, 828, 904, 942, 973–975, 995, 996, 1042, 1046, 1058, 1066.

Tied Houses — Cases in which Compensation would be paid twice over, 1081.

Time-limit, Question of, 790, 801, 802, 825, 830, 832, 846, 849, 851, 853, 859, 862, 863, 939, 940, 941, 956, 963, 967, 968, 982, 984, 985, 997, 998, 1049, 1052–1055, 1061, 1066, 1067, 1081, 1087, 1088, 1089.

Unfairness of the Clause, 903, 904.

Valuation of Premises, Method of, 973, 984, 1055, 1065.

Vested Interest created by, alleged, 823, 824, 828, 832, 846, 919, 921, 943–945, 956, 963, 968, 976, 983, 989, 1043, 1048, 1049, 1069, 1087.

Drunkenness.

Decrease in, not necessarily implied in Reduction of Public Houses, alleged, 780, 789, 810, 906, 907, 966, 986, 987, 992, 993, 1073.

Evils of, 779, 793, 848, 903, 946, 1056.

Interests of the Trade Safeguarded to the Exclusion of those of the Public, alleged, 784, 793, 827, 828, 848, 923, 924, 945.

Licenses.

Company Monopoly of, 1063–1065.

[*cont.*

Licensing Bill—*cont.*
- *Debate on Second Reading—cont.*
  - Licenses—*cont.*
    - Death Duties, etc., Levied on the basis of Permanent Value, 822, 910, 952.
    - Enhanced Value of, conferred by the Bill, 783, 794, 798, 810, 819, 829, 852, 861, 919-921, 970, 984, 1080.
    - Holders of, in the position of mere tenants, number of, 942, 973.
    - Monopoly value of, securing to the country, proposed, 854–856, 945.
    - New Conditions of granting, 863, 974.
      - Confirmation of, by Quarter Sessions, 795, 934.
      - Monopoly value—money to go into the compensation fund, alleged, 1051, 1052, 1058.
    - On-licences, market value of, 809.
    - Private property in, elimination of, proposed, 854–856, 858, 860.
    - Property value of, legality of, etc., 783, 794, 798, 802, 804, 822, 823, 825, 828, 852, 862, 900, 910, 911, 917, 919, 933, 943, 952, 955–957, 972–974, 1039, 1046, 1066, 1078, 1086.
    - Reduction in number of.
      - Appeal to County and Borough Justices instead of to Quarter Sessions, proposed, 812, 906.
      - Consideration of cases first by Committee with appeal to the whole body of Magistrates, proposed, 967.
      - Consultation between Committee of Quarter Sessions and local justices in cases of difference of opinion, 910, 934.
      - County authority, granting discretionary powers to, proposed, 792, 796, 797.
      - Effect of, on drunkenness, 780, 789, 810, 906, 907, 966, 986, 987, 992, 993, 1073.
      - Inadequacy of compensation fund, alleged, 781, 790, 800, 803, 804, 817, 818, 830, 832, 905, 954, 966, 983, 993, 994, 1040, 1042, 1061, 1080.
      - Insuring against possibility of, proposed, 1040, 1041.
      - Justices to give reasons in writing for decisions, 814, 815, 910, 925.

Licensing Bill—*cont.*
- *Debate on Second Reading—cont.*
  - Licenses—*cont.*
    - Reduction in Number of—*cont.*
      - Local Authorities, grantin powers to, proposed, 916 958, 1036, 1076, 1084 1085.
      - Magistrates.
        - Action of, in forcibly reducing licences, 916- 918, 927, 929, 930 961, 962, 964, 965 972, 976–978, 1034 1047, 1083.
        - Powers of, as to, destroyed by the Bill alleged, 781, 782, 789 791, 792, 808, 831, 900 901, 916, 918, 920, 921 924, 931, 934, 935, 955 961, 987, 989, 997 1050, 1057, 1069 1083.
      - Necessity for, and advantage of, etc., 908, 914, 943, 946 953, 966, 1060, 1079.
      - Number of, under Brewste Sessions, 804, 966, 969, 993, 994, 1091.
      - Quarter Sessions, Transfer o Power to, from Loca Magistrates, 781, 792, 811–814, 820, 821, 831, 847, 906, 920, 955, 958, 970, 971, 989, 996, 1036–1038, 1050, 1051, 1057, 1060, 1071, 1074.
      - Reports to Committee o Quarter Sessions, 814, 815, 910, 935, 1050.
      - Right of Members of Petty Sessions to Vote at Quarter Sessions for thei recommendations, 973.
    - Temperance Magistrates, alleged exclusion of, from the Bench 815, 816.
    - Temporary nature of, 783, 794, 798, 802, 804, 822, 823, 825, 828, 852, 862, 900, 910, 911, 917, 919, 933, 943, 952, 955–957, 972, 973, 1039, 1046, 1053, 1054, 1063, 1069, 1077, 1078, 1086.
    - Tied Houses, Forfeiture of Licence by, proposed, 905.
    - Voluntary Surrender of, Effect of the Bill on, 794, 828.
  - Local Option, Failure of, 788.
  - Postponement of Second Reading proposed, 778, 779, 849.
  - Quarter Sessions.
    - Appeals to.
      - Abolition of, proposed, 1076, 1084.

[*cont.*

Licensing Bill—*cont.*
Debate on Second Reading—cont.
Quarter Sessions—*cont.*
Appeals to—*cont.*
First Offence — Amendment to Clause 1, proposed, 847.
Points on which Appeals could be made, 796.
Witnesses, Power to hear, 813, 814.
Compensation, Powers as to, 814, 922, 935, 942, 990.
Reduction of Licences, Powers as to, 781, 792, 812–814, 820, 821, 847, 906, 920, 955, 958, 970, 971, 989, 996, 1036–1038, 1050, 1051, 1057, 1060, 1071, 1074.
Right of Members of Petty Sessions to Vote for their own Recommendations at, 973.
Reforms, slow progress made with, in the last thirty years, 927, 942, 949, 1082.
Temperance, promotion of, aimed at, alleged, 779, 787, 793, 796, 799, 826, 843, 992, 1035, 1041, 1062, 1067, 1072, 1073.
Tied Houses.
Compensation, payment of, twice over in cases of, alleged, 1081.
Forfeiture of Licences by, proposed, 905.
Scandals of the System, 985, 986, 1059.
Brewery Shareholders or Proprietors, allowing, to act as Licensing Justices —Inserting Clause in Bill.
Q. Sir T. Dewar; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *May 9*, 761.
Charges, Imposition and Collection of.
Q. Major Jameson; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *May 9*, 740, 741.
Compensation.
Brewery Companies and Actual Licencees, Proportion between.
Q. Mr. Corbett; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *May 5*, 535, 536.
Time Limit for Claiming—Inserting Amending Clause, etc.
Q. Mr. J. A. Pease; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *May 11*, 1028.
Extending Provisions to other Parts of United Kingdom.
Q. Sir J. Leng; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *May 9*, 775.
Licensed Premises.
Returns Relative to, Date of Tabling.
Q. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *May 3*, 268.
Valuation of, Basis of Calculation of.
Q. Mr. Ashton; *A.* Mr. Cochrane, *May 2*, 114.
Return presented, *May 3*, 239.

Licensing Bill—*cont.*
Licensed Premises—*cont.*
Value, Annual, Information as to.
Qs. Mr. H. Roberts; *As.* Mr. Cochrane, *May 2*, 114, 115.
Return presented, *May 3*, 239.
Off-Licence Holders, inclusion of, in Provisions of Bill.
Q. Mr. S. Young; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *May 3*, 251, 252.
Quarter Sessional Areas, Number of.
Q. Dr. Hutchinson; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *Apr. 29*, 13.

Light Load Line
See under Merchant Shipping.

Light Railways
Orders presented, *May 12*, 1151; *May 13*, 1272.

Lights and Lighthouses
Dues Collected and Amount Expended during Year ended 31st Mar., 1904.
Q. Mr. Plummer; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *May 10*, 886.
Inspection of.
Reports presented, *May 12*, 1151; *May 13*, 1272.
Ireland.
Kenmare Bay, Erection of Gas Buoy on the Maiden, proposed.
O. Mr. Joyce, *May 13*, 1310.
Lightship Keepers, Certificates of—Instructions to Keepers in the event of Drifting, &c.
Q. Maj. Jameson; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *May 10*, 886, 887.
Limerick Harbour Commissioners' Application ignored by the Lights Board.
O. Mr. Joyce, *May 13*, 1310.
Merchant Shipping [Lighthouses] Bill, *see that title.*
Wireless Telegraphy as a means of Communication, Delay in adopting.
O. Maj. Jameson, *May 3*, 1343.

Limavady
Telephone Extension from Ballymena to, Cause of Delay in commencing Works.
Q. Mr. O'Doherty; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Apr. 29*, 14–15.

Limerick
Lighthouse, Application of Harbour Commissioners for, ignored by the Lights Board.
O. Mr. Joyce, *May 13*, 1310.

Liquor Licensing, Etc.
Alcohol for Manufacturing Purposes, Importation of, Duty Free, proposed.
Q. Sir E. Flower; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *May 2*, 100–101.

[*cont.*

Liquor Licensing, Etc.—*cont.*

Beer, *see that title.*

Intoxicating Liquor (Licensing) Bill 1871, Reprinting of, proposed.
Q. Mr. L. Morgan; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *May 2*, 125, 126.

Licensed Premises.

Constabulary, Royal Irish — Constables having an Interest in Public Houses, Transferring, to another County.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 9*, 772.

Estate Duty on.

Average Number of Years Purchase of Licence Value charged.
Q. Mr. Lambert; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *May 4*, 383.

Valuation for, Method of.
Q. Mr. Peel; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *May 2*, 100.
Qs. Mr. Ashton, Mr. Lambert; *As.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *May 2*, 110, 111.

Scotland, Method in, etc.
Q. Mr. Black; *A.* Mr. Chamberlain, *May 9*, 759, 760.

Tabling Papers.
Qs. Mr. H. Hobhouse; *As.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *May 3*, 248; *May 5*, 527, 528.

Ground Landlords of London, Number of Houses closed by — Notice given, etc.
Q. Mr. Cremer; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *May 9*, 776.

Hotels, Ale and Beerhouses—Granting Classified Return according to County and County Boroughs, etc.
Q. Mr. H. Hobhouse; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *May 12*, 1152.

Leaseholders of, deprived of Licences—Position as to existing Covenants.
Q. Mr. Gretton; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *May 6*, 646.

Values, Aggregate Annual, in each County and County Borough.
Q. Mr. H. Hobhouse; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *May 5*, 523-524.

Estimated Value unlicensed—Granting Return.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *May 9*, 740.

Licenses.

Monopoly value of.
Qs. Mr. E. Robertson, *May 16*, 1459-1460.

Liquor Licensing, Etc.—*cont.*

Licenses—*cont.*

Proportion of, to Population (England and Wales) 1880.
Q. Mr. E. Robertson; *A.* Mr A. Douglas, *May 4*, 384.

Refusal to renew.

Compensation, granting, t Brewery Servants holding Licences.
Q. Mr. Bayley; *A.* Mr. A Douglas, *May 3*, 239 240.

Granting Return for last Five Years, etc.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *May 9*, 740.

Number of Refusals.
Q. Mr. McKenna; *A.* Mr. Cochrane, *May 2*, 113-114.

Quarter Sessions—Right of, Appeal from.
Q. Sir J. Dorington; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *May 3*, 240-241.

Decisions of Licensing Justices reversed by, 1894-1903.
Q. Sir J. Dorington *A.* Mr. A. Douglas *May 3*, 240-241.

Scotland, in—Number withdrawn fo Causes other than Misconduc since 1880.
Q. Mr. M. Ferguson; *A.* Mr A. G. Murray, *May 9*, 745 746.

Licensing Bill, *see that title.*

Liquor Traffic.

Whisky, *see that title.*

Liquor Traffic Local Veto (Scotland) Bill

c. 2R., *Apr. 29*, 71.

Lisburn.

Hurling Matches, Disturbances with regard to—Steps to be taken.
Q. Mr. J. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 9*, 769-770.

Little Canfield, Essex.

Burial Service, Refusal of Vicar to read—Taking Steps to prevent Recurrenc of Incident.
Q. Mr. J. A. Pease; *A.* Mr. A Douglas, *May 16*, 1364-1365.

Liverpool and London and Globe Insurance Company Bill

c. Rep.*, *May 12*, 1146.

Stamp Duties—Resolution (Mr. Caldwell), *May 3*, 236; *May 4*, 369.

Llanelly Harbour Bill.

l. Rep.* *May 3*, 221.
3R.* *May 6*, 633.
c. 1R.* *May 6*, 641.
2R.* *May 16*, 1361.

Lloyd-George, Mr. D. [Carnarvon District]
Bishoprics of Southwark and Birmingham Bill, 2R. *May 4*, 446.
Licensing Bill, 2R. *May 10*, 940, 951.

Lobsters
Boiling of, alive, in Restaurants, alleged, *Q.* Mr. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. Cochrane, *May 2*, 126.

Local Authorities
Gas undertakings of.
Return ordered, *May 10*, 885.
Methods of conducting business, enormous increase of indebtedness, etc.
O. Sir F. Banbury, *Apr. 29*, 38.

Local Government Act, 1888
Medical Officer, Whole-time—Return of Counties having appointed.
Q. Mr. F. Wilson; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *May 12*, 1156.

Local Government Board
Duties, &c., Committee of Inquiry into—Date of Report.
Q. Mr. C. Hay; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *May 2*, 112.

Local Government Board (Ireland)
Ballymena and Bangor Urban County Districts, Orders presented, *May 6*, 635, 643.
Enniskillen Urban County District, Order presented, *Apr. 29*, 4, 11.
Report, Annual—Date of tabling, etc.
Q. Mr. Sheehan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 12*, 1179–1180.
Thurles, refusal of outdoor poor relief at, alleged.
Q. Mr. K. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 2*, 122, 123.

Local Government (Ireland) Act
Landlords of Small Holdings—Liability for Rates—Proposed Amendment of the Act.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 12*, 1161–1162.
Order, Date of issue.
Q. Mr. Sheehy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 2*, 120.

Local Government (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill
c. 2R. *Apr. 29*, 17.
Debate on Second Reading [Commons], *Apr. 29*, 17.
Administration of Ireland—Consulting the wishes of the people, proposed, 18–23, 33, 58.
Boycotting, prevalence of, 37, 48, 49.
Coercion Act.
Classes of Crimes dealt with under, 48–50.

Local Government (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill—*cont.*
Debate on Second Reading—cont.
Coercion Act—*cont.*
Convictions under, character of, 24, 25, 29, 32, 33, 40, 42, 47 49.
Repeal of, proposed, 23.
Crimelessness of Ireland as compared with England, Scotland, and Wales, 56.
Government attitude towards the Bill, 23, 26, 42, 45, 64.
Lynch, Col., Case of, 32.
Over-taxation of Ireland, 22.
Political disqualification of Irishmen from sitting on Local Councils, 18, 20, 22, 24–30, 32–42, 44–47, 50, 53, 54, 57, 64, 66–68.
Successful working of Local Government in Ireland, 23, 35.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill
c. 1R.* *May 4*, 369.
2R.* *May 13*, 1290.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill
c. 1R.* *May 4*, 370.
2R.* *May 13*, 1290.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill
c. 1R.* *May 6*, 640.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill
c. 1R.* *May 12*, 1146.

Local Government Provisional Order (Poor Law) Bill
l. 1R.* *Apr. 29*, 3.

Local Government Provisional Orders (Gas) Bill
c. 1R.* *May 2*, 87.
2R.* *May 13*, 1290.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill
c. Rep.* *Apr. 29*, 10.
3R.* *May 2*, 86.
l. 1R.* *May 3*, 222.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill
c. Rep.* *May 6*, 641.
3R.* *May 9*, 736.
l. 1R.* *May 10*, 866.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill
c. 2R.* *May 2*, 86.
Rep.* *May 12*, 1146.
3R.* *May 13*, 1290.
l. 1R.* *May 16*, 1358.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill
c. 1R.* *May 2*, 86.
2R.* *May 11*, 1001.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill
c. 1R.* *May 2*, 86.
2R.* *May 16*, 1361.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill
c. 1R.* *May 2*, 87.
2R.* *May 16*, 1361.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill
c. 1R.* *May 6*, 638.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill
c. 1R.* *May 6*, 638.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill
c. 1R.* *May 6*, 639.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 12) Bill
c. 1R.* *May 6*, 639.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 13) Bill
c. 1R.* *May 6*, 639.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 14) Bill
c. 1R.* *May 10*, 881.

Local Government Provisional Order (No. 15) Bill
c. 1R.* *May 16*, 1362.

Local Government (Scotland) Bill
c. 1R.* *May 5*, 550.

Local Loans Fund
Capital and Income of
Accounts presented, *May 9*, 739 ; *May 10*, 867.

Lochcarron, Ross-shire
Water supply, Remedying defects of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Weir ; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *May 2*, 118.

Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. [Essex, Epping]
Aged Pensioners Bill, 2R., *May 6*, 691.
District Messenger Service — Telephone attachment to dial, refusal of Post Office to sanction use of, *May 12*, 1260.
Lee River, Poisoning of fish in, by outflow from Waltham Abbey Ordnance Factory, *May 16*, 1374.
Registration of Clubs (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *May 6*, 658.

Locomotives on Highways
Motor Cars, *see that title.*

Loder, Mr. G. W. E. [Brighton]
Merchant Shipping — Committee Recommendations, Steps to carry out, *May 9*, 744.
Telephone Service between Brighton and London, Arranging for more efficient service, *May 16*, 1367.

London
Postal Service between Paris and—Late Letter posting—Granting London same Facilities as Paris.
Q. Mr. Pirie ; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 6*, 645.
Telephone Service between Brighton and— Arranging for more efficient Service.
Q. Mr. Loder ; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 16*, 1367–1368.
Vehicular Traffic Regulations—Communicating with Police — Proceedings against Messrs. Carter Paterson & Co.
Q. Mr. Causton ; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *May 16*, 1383.

London and India Docks Company Bill
c. Rep.* *May 5*, 516.
Con. *May 13*, 1290.

London County Council
Education Committee—Exclusion of Public and Press from Meetings.
Q. Mr. Atherley-Jones ; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *May 16*, 1384.
Expenditure and borrowings, increase in.
O. Mr. H. Fisher, *May 16*, 1428.
Lunatics, Institutions established for treatment of, by.
Os. Sir. J. Tuke, *May 12*, 1194 ; Dr. Farquharson, 1199 ; Mr. Brigg, 1200.

Londonderry
Post Office.
Alterations proposed, Date of commencing, etc.
Q. Mr. Wood ; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 11*, 1008.
Learners, qualified, without Appointments—Providing Situations for, etc.
Q. Mr. Wood ; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 11*, 1007–1008.
Shipbuilding Yard, recommending, to a share of Naval Work.
Q. Mr. Murphy ; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *May 12*, 1183–1184.
Telephone Extension from Ballymena, Cause of Delay in commencing Works.
Q. Mr. O'Doherty ; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Apr. 29*, 14–15.

Londonderry, Marquess of—*Lord President of the Council and President of the Board of Education.*
Education (Transferred Schools) Bill, 1R., *May 9*, 720.

London (Providence Place, Poplar) Improvement Scheme, 1890
Modifications in.
Statement presented, *May 6*, 634, 643.

London United Tramways Bill
c. Rep.* *May 5*, 516.

Long, Rt. Hon. W. H.—*President of the Local Government Board* [Bristol, S.]
Aged Pensioners Bill, 2R., *May 6*, 692.
Aliens — Poor Law Relief other than Medical, Numbers in receipt of, *May 4*, 385.
Arsenical Poisoning—Recommendations of Royal Commission, Adopting—Fixing a Standard of Purity for Beer, etc., *May 11*, 1009.
Borough Councils, Indebtedness of—Date of presenting Return, *May 11*, 1008.
Butchers, Paddington — Sanitary Inspector's Instructions regarding Pig Carcases, *May 4*, 384–385.
Education Rate, Accepting Part Payment of, *May 3*, 242.
Housing of the Working Classes — Administration of Acts, transfer of, to Local Government Board proposed, *May 2*, 115, 116.
Kent Water Company, Well of, at Darenth, liability of, to Pollution—Instituting Inquiry, *May 12*, 1171.
Medical Officer of Health, Whole-Time, granting Return of Counties having appointed, *May 12*, 1156.
Motor Cars.
  Act—Report of Departmental Committee, Date of presenting, *May 3*, 243.
  Heavy Motor Vehicles, Regulations for—Date of Issue, *May 11*, 1009.
  Record-breaking tours, Police supervision of, *May 2*, 116.
  Registration Marks on, *May 4*, 375-376.
Nursing.
  State Registration of Nurses, *May 2*, 97–98.
  Workhouses—Issuing general Order consequent on Committee recommendations, *May 16*, 1366.
Plague spread by means of Rats—Fumigating Vessels from Plague-infected Ports, *May 3*, 250.
Poor Law.
  Administration of, improvements in system of, *May 6*, 694, 696.
  Aliens, numbers in receipt of relief other than Medical, *May 4*, 385.
  Institutions, Corporal punishment in, Regulation of, *May 10*, 888
  Paupers, Total number of, inclusive of vagrants and lunatics—Statistics for 1903, *May 6*, 695.
Ray, River, Insanitary condition of—Obliging Local authorities to cleanse, *May 16*, 1366.

Long, Rt. Hon. W. H.—*cont.*
Small pox in East London—Cause—Number of Patients removed by Metropolitan Asylums Board, *May 3*, 250.
Valuation Bill, Allowing Time for Full Consideration of, *May 9*, 742.
Workhouses, Nursing of sick poor in—Issuing general Order consequent on Committee recommendations, *May 16*, 1366.

Longford
Abusive Soldier at, taking Action against. *Qs.* Mr. J. P. Farrell, Mr. J. Redmond; *As.* Mr. Atkinson, *May 4*, 387–388.
Police Barracks—Temporary Prisoners, Improving Places of Detention for.
  Q. Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 4*, 394.
Post Office—Night Work, Arrangements as to.
  Q. Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 3*, 263.

Lonsdale, Mr. J. B. [Armagh, Mid.]
Business of the House, Course of, *May 4*, 397.
Galway, Extra Police charges in—Distinguishing from the case of Armagh, *May 16*, 1374.
Post Office—Cash on Delivery System, Introduction of, *May 4*, 373.
Trinity College Lands—Commission of Inquiry into Sale—Terms of Reference, *May 4*, 389–390.

Lord Advocate for Scotland
Mr. Scott Dickson

Lord Chancellor
Earl of Halsbury.

Lord Chancellor of Ireland
Lord Ashbourne.

Lord Chief Justice
Lord Alverstone.

Lord Great Chamberlain
Marquess of Cholmondeley.

Lord Justice-General of Scotland
Lord Kinross.

Lord Lieutenant of Ireland
Earl of Dudley.

Lord President of the Privy Council
Marquess of Londonderry.

Lord Privy Seal
Marquess of Salisbury.

Lord Tredegar's Supplemental Estate Bill
l. 1R.* *May 6*, 633.

Lot's Eyot

Barge Dock on South-east side of, Proposed Construction of—Making Protests.
Q. Mr. Skewes-Cox; *A.* Mr. A. Followes, *May 12*, 1156–1157.

Lottery Circulars

Budapest, in connection with Drawings at—Posting in London by English Agent—Instituting Inquiries.
Q. Sir T. Dewar; *A.* Earl Percy, *May 9*, 744.

Suppression of, by the Post Office, suggested.
Os. Mr. H. Heaton, *May 12*, 1227; Lord Stanley, 1255, 1260; Mr. C. Wason, 1260, 1261.

Lough, Mr. T. [Islington, W.]

Business of the House, Course of, *May 2*, 128.

Finance Bill—Date of Second Reading, *May 3*, 366.

Omnibus Drivers and Conductors—Suspension of Licences by Police Authority, *May 3*. 240.

Provisional Order (Marriages) Bill, 2R., *May 3*, 366.

Tibet Expedition.

Lhasa, Advance to—Mr. Flynn's Motion for Adjournment, *May 12*, 1187.

Negotiations with Tibet, *May 12*, 1168.

Tobacco Duty.

Drawback on stripped Stalks—allowing Duty on Cigars and Cigarettes, *May 3*, 248–249.

Increase in—Budget proposals, *May 3*, 311.

Unclaimed dividends on Government Stock, appropriation of, to pay off Budget deficit, *May 3*, 364.

Lowe, Mr. F. W. [Birmingham, Edgbaston].

Bishoprics of Southwark and Birmingham Bill, 2R., *May 4*, 421.

Lowther, Rt. Hon. J. W.—*Chairman of Committees* [Cumberland, Penrith]
(*for Rulings as Chairman, see* Chairman).

Milwr and District Mines Drainage Bill, 2R., *May 9*, 839.

Speaker, Indisposition of—appointment of Mr. Lowther as Deputy Speaker, *May 10*, 879; *May 11*, 1001; *May 12*, 1145.

Lucas, Mr. R. J. [Portsmouth]

Militia and Volunteers, Report of Commission—Proposed Government Action, *April 29*, 16.

Navy—Explosives used for Practice, Compensation for Damage by, *May 3*, 243.

Lunacy

Bill of 1900, Re-introduction of, proposed,
Os. Dr. Farquharson; Sir R. Finlay, *May 12*, 1212.

Causes of.
Os. Mr. Brigg, *May 12*, 1201; Lord E. Fitzmaurice, 1206.

Commission on.

Constitution of, Inadequate number of, etc.
Os. Sir J. Tuke, *May 12*, 1188, 1190; Dr. Farquharson, 1200; Sir J. Dorington, 1207, 1208; Sir R. Finlay, 1210.

Division of England and Wales into four or five districts with Resident Commissioners, proposed
O. Sir J. Tuke, *May 12*, 1192, 1193.

Duties of.
Os. Sir J. Tuke, *May 12*, 1188; Dr. Farquharson, 1200.

Instructions and directions given by, conflicting nature of.
Os. Mr. Brigg, *May 12*, 1201, 1202; Lord E. Fitzmaurice, 1207.

Legal Commissioners, Anachronism of,
Os. Sir J. Tuke, *May 12*, 1191, 1192; Dr. Hutchinson, 1204; Sir J. Dorington, 1208.

Medical Commissioners, Increase in number of, proposed.
Os. Sir M. Foster, *May 12*, 1196; Dr. Hutchinson, 1204.

Scotland, System in.
Os. Sir J. Tuke, *May 12*, 1188, 1189; Sir R. Finlay, 1209.

Work of, Tributes to.
O. Lord E. Fitzmaurice, *May 12*, 1207.

Inquiry into the whole question, Appointment of a Commission of, proposed.
Os. Sir J. Tuke, *May 12*, 1195; Sir M. Foster, 1197; Dr. Farquharson, 1198; Mr. Brigg, 1201, 1202; Dr. Hutchinson, 1204; Lord E. Fitzmaurice, 1206, 1207; Sir J. Dorington, 1209; Sir R. Finlay, 1211; Sir E. Strachy, 1212.

Notification of, proposed.
Os. Sir M. Foster, *May 12*, 1197; Dr. Farquharson, 1199.

Pathological institutions for study of, establishment of, proposed.
O. Dr. Farquharson, *May 12*, 1199.

Lunatics

Asylums.

Ballinasloe — Appointment of Dr. Kirwan.

Confirmation of.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 9*, 772–773.

[*cont.*

Lunatics—*cont.*
- Asylums—*cont.*
  - Confirmation of—*cont.*
    - Delay in Sanctioning.
      - *Q.* Mr. Roche; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 5*, 531.
      - *Q.* Col. Nolan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 6*, 647-648.
      - *Qs.* Mr. Roche, Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 16*, 1386-1387.
  - Children, separate treatment for, proposed.
    - *O.* Mr. Brigg, *May 12*, 1201.
  - Increase in number of.
    - *Qs.* Sir J. Tuke, *May 12*, 1190, 1193; Lord E. Fitzmaurice, 1205, 1206; Sir R. Finlay, 1209.
  - Incurables, class of accommodation to be provided for — Differentiating from curables, proposed.
    - *O.* Mr. Brigg, *May 12*, 1201.
  - Institutions for treatment of incipient cases, establishment of, proposed.
    - *Os.* Sir J. Tuke, *May 12*, 1193, 1194; Sir M. Foster, 1197; Mr. G. Bowles, 1202, 1203; Dr. Hutchinson, 1204; Sir J. Dorington, 1208, 1209; Sir R. Finlay, 1211.
  - London County Council, work of, in providing institutions, etc.
    - *Os.* Sir. J. Tuke, *May 12*, 1194; Dr. Farquharson, 1199; Mr. Brigg, 1200.
  - Visitors of—Number of visits made and patients seen by—Report presented, *May 9*, 703, 738.

Lundon, Mr. W. [Limerick, E.]
- Kingston Estate, Cork—Sale to Tenants, Terms of, *May 11*, 1024.
- Pallaskenry, alleged offensive notice exhibited in — Persistent Insults to Members of Roman Catholic Church, *May 11*, 1026.

Lytham Improvement Bill
- c. Rep.* *May 13*, 1291.

Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred—*Secretary of State for the Colonies* [Warwick and Leamington]
- Africa, South.
  - Jameson Raid—Chartered Company's Liability for payment of Indemnity, *May 3*, 246.
  - Supplies for, Purchase of, by Crown Agents—Commissions paid 1900–1903, *May 9*, 750.
- Canada, Immigrants into, 1902-3, Numbers and Nationality of, *Apr. 29*, 17.
- Crown Agents for the Colonies.
  - Articles tendered for during past three years, etc., *May 16*, 1375.
  - Salaries, Commissions, etc., *May 13*, 1298-1299; *May 16*, 1375-1376.

Lyttleton, Hon. Alfred—*cont.*
- Crown Agents for the Colonies—*cont.*
  - Transactions for 1903—Granting Return showing Number, Date, Amount involved etc., of each Transaction, *May 12*, 1164.
  - Transvaal, purchases for.
    - Class of requirements supplied, Restrictions on powers of Crown Agents, etc., *May 2*, 105, 106.
    - Commissions paid 1900-1903, *May 9*, 750.
- Immigration Regulations in British Colonies, *May 4*, 380.
- Jamaica—Matches, Excise Duty on, *May 2*, 109.
- Licensing Bill, 2R., *May 9*, 817.
- New Guinea, British, reported Disturbances in—Instituting Inquiries, etc., *May 4*, 381-382; *May 12*, 1164.
- New South Wales Birth Rate, Decline of—Tabling Committee Report, *Apr. 29*, 17.
- Orange River Colony.
  - Census Return, Date of, *May 2*, 107.
  - Civil Service Estimates, Class 5, Total Sum expended under, 1901-2 and 1902-3, *May 12*, 1159.
  - Natives—Repatriation after the War, *May 5*, 533.
- Swaziland—refunding Customs Duties paid to Transvaal Government, *May 12*, 1166.
- Transvaal,
  - Census Return, Date of, *May 2*, 107.
  - Chinese Labour, Importation of.
    - Cape Colony Legislative Assembly, Resolution of, against—Terms—Date of adopting, *May 11*, 1014-1015.
    - Chinese Government, Position of Negotiations with, *May 12*, 1164-1165.
    - Commissariat Arrangements, *May 16*, 1378.
    - Convention, signing of, *May 12*, 1165.
    - Hong-Kong.
      - Cost of housing intending Emigrants at, *May 12*, 1166.
      - Plague at, postponing Importation during Prevalence of, etc., *May 9*, 756-757.
    - Unskilled work, provisions for restriction to, *May 2*, 108.
    - Wages Regulations, *May 5*, 533.
    - Wives and Families of Labourers—Cost of Repatriation, Regulations as to, *May 10*, 889; *May 12*, 1163.

Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred—*cont.*
- Transvaal—*cont.*
  - Civil Service Estimates, Class 5, Total Sum expended under, 1901–2 and 1902–3, *May 12*, 1159.
  - Labour Question.
    - Chinese, Importation of, *see subheading* Transvaal—Chinese.
    - Natives in Mines.
      - Cape of Good Hope Blue Book G. 4, 1904, Date of Tabling, *May 11*, 1012.
      - Mortality among.
        - Date of publishing Return, *May 5*, 757–758.
        - Rate of, and reasons for, Steps taken to check, etc., *May 5*, 613–617.
        - Tabling Reports, *May 11*, 1013.
        - Total Number of Deaths on the Rand 1903—Granting Return, etc., *May 11*, 1013-1014.
      - Numbers employed 1903 and 1904, Statistics as to, *May 12*, 1162–1163.
      - Recruiting—methods of the Native Labour Supply Association, *May 5*, 599, 600, 611.
      - Report of Doctors, Tabling, proposed, *May 16*, 1378.
      - Treatment, allegations as to cruelty and wages, etc., *May 5*, 550, 607-613.
    - White labour in Mines, proportion of, before and since the War, *May 2*, 107.
  - Magistracy, Return relative to, Date of presenting, *May 11*, 1015.
  - Mines.
    - Gold Output, Statistics as to—Kaffirs employed, *May 4*, 378–379; *May 9*, 751–752.
    - Labour in, *see subheading* Transvaal—Labour.
  - Supplies for, Purchase of, by Crown Agents.
    - Class of Requirements supplied—Restrictions on Powers of Crown Agents, etc., *May 2*, 105, 106.
    - Commissions paid 1900–1903, *May 9*, 750.
  - Swaziland Mercantile Association, Customs Duties paid by, refunding, *May 12*, 1166.

McArthur, Mr. C. [Liverpool, Exchange.]
- Bishoprics of Southwark and Birmingham Bill, 2R., *May 4*, 402.
- Merchant Shipping (Lighthouses) Bill, 2R., *May 13*, 1338.

McArthur, Mr. C.—*cont.*
- Newchwang—British Life and Property, Steps to safeguard — Request of British Consul for Despatch of Gunboat, etc., *May 11*, 1015–1016.
- Ritualistic practices in Church of England, growth of, *May 4*, 403–407.

McCalmont Col. J. [Antrim. E.]
- Carrickfergus, Sewage Nuisance near, steps to remedy, *May 9*, 747.

McCrae, Mr. G. [Edinburgh, East]
- China War Indemnity — Application of instalments after paying balance of private claims, *May 16*, 1381.
- Finance Bill, 2R., *May 16*, 1432.
- Financial Policy of the Government—Increase in Expenditure and Taxation, etc., *May 16*, 1432-1441.
- National Debt, Reduction of, Estimate of Sum to be applied to, 1903–4—Sum actually applied, *May 2*, 99.
- Unclaimed dividends on Government Stock, Appropriating, to pay off Budget deficit, *May 3*, 359.

Macedonia
- Conference of Insurgent Leaders—Steps to reassure the Populace.
  - *Q.* Mr. H. Law; *A.* Earl Percy, *May 3*, 247-248.
- *Debate* (Lords) *May 5*, 499.
  - Amnesty, general, Result of, 505.
  - Austria, Inability of, to deal with situation owing to being an interested party, 514.
  - British Government.
    - Confidence felt in, by Mussulmans and Christians in Macedonia, 506.
    - Policy of, 507, 509, 514.
  - Civil agents, work done by, 500, 503, 512.
  - Conference of European Powers, proposed, 508, 510.
  - Gendarmerie—Officers, etc.
    - Exemption of, from Turkish interference, 499, 511.
    - Number of, Powers and *status*, 500, 501, 506, 510.
  - Russia, Inability of, to deal with situation owing to being an interested party, 514.
  - Turkish Government, Responsibility of, 502, 503, 509.
  - Turco-Bulgarian Agreement, Worthlessness of, alleged, 504, 509.
- Gendarmerie — Authority of European Officers.
  - *Q.* Mr. C. Allen; *A.* Earl Percy, *May 4*, 382.
- Monastir, European Consuls at—Representatives ignored by the Vali.
  - *Q.* Mr. Trevelyan; *A.* Earl Percy, *May 3*, 247.

M'Hugh, Mr. P. A. [Leitrim, N.]
Ballaghamechan and Tullaghan, Establishment of Parish Committees at, Reasons for Delay in, *May, 10* 897.
Land Purchase—Tabling Estates Commissioners' Rules, *May 5*, 541.

MacIver, Mr. D. [Liverpool, Kirkdale]
Merchant Shipping (Lighthouses) Bill, 2R., *May 13*, 1351.

McKean, Mr. J. [Monaghan, S.]
Milwr and District Mines Drainage Bill, 2R., *May 9*, 839.
Instruction to Committee, *May 12*, 1241.

McKenna, Mr. R. [Monmouth, N.]
Education — Monmouthshire, Appointed Day in, *May 12*, 1155.
Jamaica—Matches, Excise Duty on, *May 2*, 108.
Liquor Licences—Refusal of Renewal—Number refused, *May 2*, 113.
Personal Accusations made in Question Time—Opportunity for Reply, etc., *May 5*, 546, 548.
Tobacco Duty.
Increase in — Anticipations of the Budget, Allegations against Tariff Commission, etc., *May 3*, 291-299.
Unstemmed Tobacco—Importation in Anticipation of Budget Proposals—Appointing Select Committee, *May 5*, 545.

McKillop, Mr. W. [Sligo, N.]
Aughris, Scheduling, as Congested District, proposed — Facilities Afforded for Development of Fishing Industry, etc., *May 10*, 895.
Training Colleges, Increased Grants to Irish—Estimated Increase in Number of King's Scholars, *May 5*, 543,

McLaren Sir C. B. B. [Leicestershire, Bosworth]
Milwr and District Mines Drainage Bill, 2R., *May 9*, 835.

MacNeill, Mr. J. G. S. [Donegal, S.]
Bloomfield Estate, Sale of — Name of Owner, etc., *May 2*, 121.
Crofton, Hugh, Estate of — Refusal of Stamped Receipts, alleged, *May 2*, 123, 124.
Navy, Flogging in—Weight of Birch used, etc.—Modifying Regulations, *May 4*, 380.

Maconochie, Mr. A. W. [Aberdeenshire, E.]
Fraserburgh, Establishing Naval Reserve Battery at, *May 2*, 102.
Highlands and Islands of Scotland.
Fish, Affording Facilites for Transit of, and Lowering Rates for Carriage of, *May 5*, 581.

Maconochie, Mr. A. W.—*cont.*
Highlands and Islands of Scotland—*cont.*
Peat Industry, Development of, *May 5*, 581.
Whale-hunting off the Scottish Coast, Injury done to Herring Fisheries by, *May 5*, 566.

MacVeagh, Mr. J. [Down, S.]
Ballyvarley, Co. Down—Sunday Hurling Matches, Disturbances with regard to—Instituting Prosecutions, *May 9*, 768-769.
Banbridge, Disturbances at—Prosecution of Rioters, *May 9*, 773; *May 11*, 1019.
Constabulary.
Irish Guards, Inducements offered to Enlist in, *May 11*, 1019.
Irish Guards, Reservists from, Admission of, to the Force, *May 9*, 768.
Kilkeel Petty Sessions—Difficulty in obtaining Evidence of Dispensary Doctor—Adjournment of Case, *May 9*, 770-771.
Railway Rates and Transit Facilities for Agricultural Produce—Appointment of Departmental Committee of Inquiry, *May 11*, 1027.

Magazines
Canada.
Postal Rates for.
Os. Mr. Slack, *May 12*, 1266.
Reduction of, proposed.
Os. Mr. H. Heaton, *May 12*, 1228; Mr. Slack, 1266.

Magillan Camp
Telegraph Office at, Opening of, etc.
Q. Mr. Nannetti; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 11*, 1006-1007.

Magistrates and Justices of the Peace
Ballymahon Magisterial Bench, Appointing Roman Catholic to Vacancy on.
Q. Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 3*, 255-256.

Maidenhead Bridge Bill
l. 3R.* *May 2*, 74.
c. 1R.* *May 3*, 237.

Mail Service
see under Post Office.

Malcolm, Mr. J. Z. [Suffolk, Stowmarket]
Members of Parliament, Payment of, proposed, *May 11*, 1115-1118.
Merchant Shipping (Lighthouses) Bill.
2R *May 13*, 1352.

Mallow
Recreation Ground—Reason for Refusing Provisional Order to Acquire Land.
Q. Mr. W. Abraham; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 12*, 1178-1179.

Mall to Charing Cross
Road from, Date of Completion, etc.
Q. Sir H. Fowler; *A.* Lord Balcarres, *May 4*, 373.

Malta
Political Condition of.
Correspondence as to, presented, *May 5*, 518; *May 6*, 634.

Manchester
Volunteers' Camp, offering suitable Training Ground for.
Q. Mr. Schwann; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *May 3*, 244-245.

Manchester Ship Canal (Finance) Bill
l. 3R.* *Apr. 29*, 2.
c. 1R.* *May 2*, 88.
2R.* *May 11*, 1001.

Mansfield, Mr. H. [Lincolnshire, Spalding]
Gambling, Prosecutions for, during past ten years, *May 16*, 1382.
Teachers, Election of, as Members of Education Authorities, proposed Government action, *May 16*, 1383.

Marlborough, Duke of—*Parliamentary Secretary for the Colonies.*
"Scotia," Services rendered to, by "Furnessia"— Recovery of Salvage Claims against Vessels owned by the Crown, *Apr. 29*, 7.
Transvaal Labour Question—Treatment of Natives in Mines — Date of issuing Blue Books, *May 10*, 876.

Martin, Mr. R. B. [Worcestershire, Droitwich]
Bishoprics of Southwark and Birmingham Bill, 2R., *May 4*, 432.
Unclaimed Dividends on Government Stock, Appropriation of, to pay off Budget Deficit, *May 3*, 362.

Marylebone Chapels (St. James, Westmoreland Street) Bill
l. Rep.* *May 3*, 221.
3R.* *May 9*, 702.
c. 1R.* *May 10*, 881.

Maxwell, Mr. W. J. [Dumfriesshire]
Education (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *May 2*, 185.

Meath Hospital
Medical Staff—Election to Vacancies.
Q. Mr. Clancy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 6*, 644.

Medical College, Royal Army
Progress of Building.
Q. Dr. Farquharson; *A.* Mr. B. Davenport, *May 9*, 752.

Medical Officer of Health
Whole-Time, Granting Return of Counties having appointed, under the Act of 1888.
Q. Mr. F. Wilson; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *May 12*, 1156.

Medway Conservancy
Receipts and Expenditure—Statement o
Conservators presented, *May 16*, 1358
1363.

Members of Parliament
Contributions expected from, by Constitu
encies.
Os. Sir B. Gurdon, *May 11*, 1119
Mr. H. Burke, 1122; Sir C
Rasch, 1123; Sir E. Grey, 1129
Mr. A. G. Murray. 1135.

Payment of, proposed.
Os. Mr. A. Henderson, *May 11*, 1107
1109; Mr. Fenwick, 1112, 111
1115; Mr. Malcolm, 1116, 1117
Sir B. Gordon, 1118, 1119; M
Randles, 1120; Mr. H. Burke, 112
1122; Sir C. Rasch, 1123; Sir E
Grey, 1125-1129; Mr. A. G. Mu
ray, 1130–1135.

Burden to be imposed on the Rate
payer.
Os. Mr. Malcolm, *May 11*, 111
1116; Sir E. Grey, 1124.

Continental Countries and th
Colonies, Practice in, etc.
Os. Mr. A. Henderson, *May 1*
1107–1109; Mr. Fenwick
1113, 1114; Mr. H. Burke
1121.

Freedom of choice and complete re
presentation of all classes a
affected by.
Os. Mr. Fenwick, *May 11*, 111
1114; Mr. Malcolm, 1116
Mr. Randles, 1120; Sir E
Grey, 1125.

History of the Movement.
Os. Mr. Fenwick, *May 11*, 110
1110, 1112; Mr. A. G. Murra
1129.

Labour Members, increase in numbe
of, etc.
Cs. Mr. Malcolm, *May 11*, 111
1118; Sir B. Gurdon, 111
Mr. Randles, 1120; Sir
Grey, 1126, 1127; Mr.
G. Murray, 1132.

Professional Politicians, dangers
admitting to Parliament, etc.
Os. Mr. A. Henderson, *May 1*
1109; Mr. Malcolm, 111
1117; Mr. H. Burke, 112
Mr. A. G. Murray, 113
1133.

Pensions to ex-members of Governmen
practice of.
Os. Mr. A. Henderson, *May*
1108; Mr. Fenwick, 1114; M
Malcolm, 1118; Mr. A.
Murray, 1131.

Returning Officers, expenses imposed b
on Parliamentary Candidates—Pa
ment by the State, proposed.
Os. Mr. A. Henderson, *May*
1105; Mr. Malcolm, 1116; Sir
Gurdon, Mr. Randles, 1119; S
C. Rasch, 1123; Sir E. Grey, 112
1126.

[*cont.*

Members of Parliament—*cont.*
Returning Officers, &c.—*cont.*
Attempts to deal with question by means of legislation.
Os. Mr. Fenwick, *May 11*, 1109-1112.
Total expenditure in last General Election.
O. Mr. A. Henderson, *May 11*, 1105, 1106.

Merchandise Marks Bill
c 1R.* *May 2*, 128.

Merchant Service
Cunard Line—Money Committee, arranging for Discussion on.
Q. Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *May 12*, 1186.

Merchant Shipping
Committee Recommendations, Steps to carry out.
Q. Mr. Loder; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *May 9*, 744-745.
Foreign ships trading to and from ports in the United Kingdom—Applicability of Statutory requirements to.
Motion for appointment of Select Committee of Inquiry [Mr. G. Balfour], *May 3*, 368; *May 4*, 459.
Os. Mr. Caldwell, Mr. O'Mara, *May 4*, 459.
Light Load Line.
Ballast thrown overboard—Issue of warning to shipmasters—Recommendations of Select Committee.
Os. Lord Muskerry, *May 2*, 79, 84; Lord Wolverton, 81, 82.
Insufficient and improper ballasting—Failure of the Board of Trade to carry out recommendations of Select Committee.
Os. Lord Muskerry, *May 2*, 76; Lord Wolverton, 81; Earl Spencer, 82; Marquess of Lansdowne, 84.
Loading-port Clause in Ships' Articles—Results of negotiation between Board of Trade and Shipowners.
Os. Lord Muskerry, Lord Wolverton, *May 3*, 235.
Officers, Uncertificated—Defective nature of the law as to.
O. Lord Muskerry, *May 9*, 725.
"Scotia," Services to, by "Furnessia"—recovery of Salvage claims against vessels owned by the Crown.
Os. Lord Muskerry, *April 29*, 5; Duke of Marlborough, 7.
Seamen—Percentage of British, Foreign, and Lascar, etc., employed.
Os. Lord Wolverton, *May 9*, 723; Lord Brassey, 732, 733.

Merchant Shipping Bill
l. 2R., *May 9*, 722.
Debate on second reading, [Lords] *May 9*, 722.
Committee of 1902, Constitution and Terms of Reference of, and recommendations of, 722, 723, 726, 728.
Cooks—certificate of competency, provisions as to, 723-727, 729, 730, 732.
Date of bringing clauses into operation, 729, 730.
Desertions and refusals to join—withholding certificates, proposed, 724, 727.
Foreign ships, application of restrictions to, 728.
Provisions.
Inspection of, by Board of Trade Officials, 724, 730.
Scale of, adoption of that recommended by Committee of 1903, proposed, 730, 731.
Seamen.
English language, knowledge of, provisions as to, 724, 727, 730, 732.
Percentage of British, Foreign, and Lascar, etc., employed, 723, 732, 733.

Merchant Shipping (Lighthouses) Bill
c. 2R., *May 13*, 1299.
Debate on second reading [Commons] *May 13*, 1299.
Advisory Committee of the Board of Trade, work of, 1302, 1316, 1323.
Agriculturists, opposition of, to the Bill, 1313, 1319, 1324, 1325, 1352.
Board of Trade control over Lighthouse Boards, extent of, 1326, 1330, 1333, 1341, 1342.
Coast Lights.
History of, 1299.
National duty to provide, 1302, 1304, 1307, 1309, 1313, 1314, 1322, 1334.
Committees composed of shipping, insurance, and mercantile representatives to replace Lighthouse Boards, proposed, 1315.
Drafting of Bill, criticisms on, 1314, 1315.
Expenditure.
Board of Trade, Control over, 1312, 1333, 1341, 1347.
Extravagance and mismanagement by Trinity House, alleged, 1301, 1306, 1331, 1346.
Irish Lights Board, Constitution and powers of, 1301, 1309, 1310, 1329, 1330, 1331, 1345.

[*cont.*

Merchant Shipping (Lighthouses) Bill—*cont.*
Debate on second reading—cont.
Light dues.
Abolition of, proposed, 1301, 1318.
American ports, Rate of payment at, 1306, 1317, 1323.
Foreign Warships, Reasons for exemption of from payment, 1311.
History of, 1299.
Mercantile Community and Trade of the Country, Effect on, 1307, 1323, 1348, 1349.
Navy, Exemption of, from payment, 1306, 1308, 1311, 1321, 1332, 1334, 1336, 1350.
Tax on British Ports, Alleged, 1305-1307, 1319.
Yachts, Exemption of, from, proposed, 1311.
Maintenance of Lights, etc., out of public funds, proposed, 1304, 1309, 1311, 1314, 1315, 1317, 1320, 1322, 1324, 1327, 1328, 1331, 1334, 1335, 1337-1341, 1351.
Northern Lighthouses, Constitution of, Commissioners of, 1300, 1316, 1320, 1331, 1345, 1353.
Shipping industry, Condition of, 1319-1321, 1324, 1332, 1335.
Transferring control of Lighthouses to the Board of Trade, proposed, 1301, 1316, 1339, 1344, 1347, 1348.
Trinity House.
Constitution and antiquated methods of, 1300, 1308, 1313, 1316, 1336, 1345.
Funds, Control and mismanagement of, alleged, 1301, 1306, 1331, 1346.
Wireless Telegraphy as a means of communication, Delay in adoption of, 1343.

Metropolitan Asylums Board
Vivisection, Application to register Place for.
Q. Dr. Shipman; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *May 5*, 523.

Metropolitan Common Scheme (Farnborough) Provisional Order Bill
l. 2R.* *May 5*, 494.
3R.* *May 9*, 702.

Metropolitan Common Scheme (Hillingdon East) Provisional Order Bill
l. 2R.* *May 5*, 494.
3R.* *May 9*, 702.

Metropolitan District Railway Bill
l. Report from Select Committee, *May 5*, 493.
3R.* *May 6*, 633.
c. 1R.* *May 6*, 641.
2R.* *May 16*, 1361.

Metropolitan Gas Companies
Account presented, *May 2*, 76, 89.

Metropolitan Police Provisional Order Bill
l. 2R.* *May 9*, 702.
*Com.** and Rep,* *May 10*, 866.
3R.* *May 13*, 1271.

Metropolitan Railway Bill
c. Rep,* *Apr. 29*, 10.
*Con.** *May 6*, 638.
3R.*, *May 10*, 880.
l. Commons' Amendments. *Con.** *May 13*, 1270.

Middlemore, Mr. J. T. [Birmingham, N.]
Bishoprics of Southwark and Birmingham Bill, 2R., *May 4*, 433.

Middlesex
Polling Districts—County Council Order Altering—Presented, *May 9*, 703, 738.

Militia
Commission, Report of—Proposed Government Action.
Q. Mr. R. Lucas; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Apr. 29*, 16-17.
Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *May 4*, 381.
War Office Re-organisation, effect of, on Report.
Q. Capt. Norton; *A.* Mr. B. Davenport, *May 9*, 755.

Milk
Carriage of, by Railways—Allowing Locked Churns—Circulating Explanatory Leaflet.
Q. Sir E. Strachey; *A.* Mr. A. Fellowes, *May 9*, 762-763.

Milwr and District Mines Drainage Bill
c. 2R., *May 9*, 833.
Instruction to Committee, *May 12*, 1241.

Minehead Urban District Council Water Bill
l. Rep.* *May 3*, 221.
3R.* *May 9*, 702.
c. 1R.* *May 10*, 881.

Mines
Transvaal, *see under* Transvaal.

Molesworth, Sir L. W. [Cornwall, Bodmin]
Navy—Battleships—Speed Trials on the Cornish Coast—Damage to Fisheries by, *May 4*, 376.

Money Orders
see under Post Office.

Monkswell, Lord
Outdoor Relief (Friendly Societies) Bill—Breach of privilege in originating in House of Lords, *May 5*, 496, 499.

Monmouthshire
Appointed Day in.
Q. Mr. McKenna; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *May 12*, 1155.

Montagu, Mr. G. C. [Huntingdonshire, Huntingdon]
Wireless Telegraphy, Racing News distributed by, Prohibition of, *May 3*, 249.

Mooney, Mr. J. J. [Dublin Co., S.]
Dublin.
Bicycle thefts in, statistics as to, *May 16*, 1388.
College of Science, Appointment of Architect for, *May 12*, 1182, 1183.
Authority responsible for selection of, *May 9*, 775.
Englishman, Dissatisfaction at Appointment of, *May 6*, 395.
Irish Departments, Consulting, etc., *May 16*, 1387.
Registration of Clubs (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *May 6*, 667.

Moore Mr. W. [Antrim, N.]
Agricultural Department—Distribution of Funds among each Province and County — Contribution from each Province and County, *May 13*, 1297-1298.
Crimes Act, Ireland, Administration of, *May 4*, 467.
Land Purchase Act, 1903—Monopoly of Business given to Bank of Ireland—Protests of Joint Stock Banks — Placing all Banks on Same Footing, etc., *May 9*, 746.
Registration of Clubs (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *May 6*, 656.
Waterford, New Bridge at—Estimated Cost—Government and Local Contributions, *May 13*, 1297.

Morgan, Mr. J. L. [Carmarthen, W]
Bail Act, Effect of—Bringing Provisions to Notice of Justices and their Clerks, *May 2*, 93.
Inebriate Homes, Detention Regulations in, *May 2*, 113.
Intoxicating Liquors (Licensing) Bill 1871, reprinting of, proposed, *May 2*, 125.

Morpeth, Viscount [Birmingham, South]
Licensing Bill, 2R., *May 9*, 787.

Moss, Mr. S. [Denbighshire, E.]
Milwr and District Mines Drainage Bill, 2R., *May 9*, 838.

Motor Cars
Act—Report of Departmental Committee, Date of presenting.
Q. Mr. S. Cross; Mr. W. Long, *May 3*, 243.
Report presented, *May 5*, 495, 519.

Motor Cars—*cont.*
Heavy Motor Vehicles, Regulations for—Date of issue.
Q. Mr. Toulmin; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *May 11*, 1009.
Hyde Park—Speed regulations.
Qs. Mr. C. Wason; *As.* Lord Balcarres, *May 2*, 116.
Ireland, Services in, Date of starting.
Q. Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 3*, 254.
Post Office Service of, extension of.
Os. Lord Stanley, *May 12*, 1221; Mr. L. Sinclair, 1224; Mr. Weir, 1259.
Record-breaking tours, Police supervision of.
Qs. Mr. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *May 2*, 116.
Q. Mr. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *May 2*, 119.
Registration Marks on.
Q. Mr. Brigg; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *May 4*, 375-376.

Mount Bellew
National School built by Private Effort—Sanctioning Expenditure for Technical Instruction.
Q. Mr. Roche; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 12*, 1177-1178.

Mount Shannon Estate
Purchase of, to enlarge adjoining Holdings.
Q. Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 9*, 747-748.

Moy, Co. Tyrone
Morning Mail Service from, restoring.
Q. Mr. T. W. Russell; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 5*, 520.

Mullingar, Kells, and Drogheda Railway Bill
l. 1R.* *Apr. 29*, 3.
2R.* *May 6*, 633.

Municipal Expenditure
Increase in, References to, in debate on the Finance Bill, *May 16*, 1428, 1446, 1461, 1463, 1494.

Munster
Dairy School, Allocation of Grant for.
Q. Mr. Flynn; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 4*, 394.

Murnaghan, Mr. G. [Tyrone, Mid.]
Stewart Estate, Co. Tyrone — Sale to Tenants—Progress made, *May 5*, 530.

Murphy, Mr. J. [Kerry, E.]
Clonmany to Leenan Fort—Conveyance of Military Passengers—Accepting Local Contract, etc., *May 9*, 749.

[*cont.*

Murphy, Mr. J.—*cont.*

- Constabulary.
  - Bands performing in Public, Authority to stop—Case of Sergeant Frizelle, Frenchpark, *May 11*, 1018.
  - Discipline of, Newspaper Controversy regarding, Right of Magistrates to Engage in, *May 9*, 764.
- Cummeen, Increased postal facilities to proposed, *May 16*, 1366.
- Derry Shipbuilding Yard, recommending, to a Share of Naval Work, *May 12*, 1183.
- Kenmare Estate—Proposed Sale by Townlands—Power of Commissioners to sanction Scheme, *May 12*, 1179.
- Kerry, Evictions in—Steps taken to re-instate tenants, *May 16*, 1389.
- Knocknagoshel, Co. Kerry, Sunday Postal Delivery at, *May 9*, 774.
- Land Purchase—Sales to Tenants—Dividing Estates properly, *May 11*, 1024.
- Leamyglissane, Daily Postal delivery at, proposed, *May 16*, 1366.
- Local Government (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill, 2R., *Apr. 29*, 28.
- Rockfield Estate, Co. Kerry, Sale of—Forcing Terms on Tenants, etc., *May 5*, 543.

Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G.—*Secretary for Scotland* [Buteshire]

- Avoch Harbour, Construction of, Government grant for, *May 5*, 525 ; *May 16*, 1364.
- Barvas, Destitution in, Consequent on failure of Crops—Relief Works proposed, *May 2*, 119.
- Congested Districts Board.
  - Land for Holdings, purchase of, *May 5*, 589, 590.
  - Work of—Criticisms on Report, etc., *May 5*, 589, 590.
- Crofting Counties—Decrease in Population—Select Committee of Inquiry proposed, *May 11*, 1141.
- Crosbost, Burying ground of—Acquisition of new ground, *May 2*, 119.
- Deer Forests, Acreage of, Returns as to, *May 5*, 569.
- Education [Scotland] Bill, 2R., *May 2*, 150, 198, 206.
  - Committee Stage of, *May 5*, 539.
- Erbusaig School, steps to remedy unsatisfactory Water Supply at, *May 16*, 1364.
- Fisheries—Report of Board, Date of publishing, *May 16*, 1364.
- Liquor Licences, Number of, withdrawn for Causes other than Misconduct since 1880, *May 9*, 745–749.
- Lochcarron Water Supply, remedying defects of, proposed, *May 2*, 118.

Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G.—*cont.*

- Members of Parliament, Payment of, proposed, *May 11*, 1129-37.
  - Professional Politicians, dangers of admitting to Parliament, *May 11*, 1132, 1133.
- Motor Cars—Record-breaking tours, Enforcement of Speed Regulations on, *May 2*, 119.
- Orkney.
  - Fisheries, Crown and private right to, *May 5*, 588.
  - Road construction in—Delays, *May 5*, 588.
- Wild Birds Protection Act, Publishing clearer notices under, *May 13*, 1294.

Music

- Teachers of—Registration of, Delay as to. *Q.* Mr. Agg-Gardner ; *A.* Sir W. Anson, *May 5*, 524.

Muskerry, Lord

- Merchant Shipping.
  - Light Load Line—Failure of Board of Trade to carry out recommendations of Select Committee, *May 2*, 79, 84.
  - Loading-port Clause in Ships' Articles, interpretation of, *May 3*, 235.
  - Officers, uncertificated, Defective nature of the Law as to, *May*, 725.
  - "Scotia," Services rendered to, by "Furnessia"—recovery of Salvage claims against Vessels owned by the Crown, *Apr. 29*, 5.
- Merchant Shipping Bill, 2R., *May 9*, 725.
- Navy—Royal Naval Reserve.
  - Age limit, extension of, proposed, *May 6*, 635.
  - Commander, Qualifications for rank of, *May 6*, 635.
- United Irish League, Resolution of, to compel Sales by Landlords before May rents become due, alleged, *May 10*, 876.

Nannetti, Mr. J. P. [Dublin, College Green]

- American Mail Landed at Queenstown, Sorting of, etc., *May 3*, 259, 260.
- Army.
  - Irish Garrisons, Military Stores for—Contract Value of Saddlery, etc., Supplied from Woolwich, 1900–1903, etc., *May 9*, 754–755.
  - Island Bridge Barracks Workshop, Closing of—Expenditure on Imported Carts and Wagons, 1900–1903, etc., *May 9*, 754.
- Dublin Post Office, *see sub-heading* Post Office.

Nannetti, Mr. J. P.—*cont.*
Housing of the Working Classes in Ireland —Legislation proposed, *May 2*, 120, 121.
Magillan Camp, opening Telegraph Office at, etc., *May 11*, 1006.
Milwr and District Mines Drainage Bill, Instruc. to Com., *May 12*, 1242.
Post Office.
Appointments, Favouritism shown in filling up, alleged, *May 12*, 1238–1240, 1246, 1247.
Dual-workers, Objections to System, *May 12*, 1236, 1255.
Dublin.
Extra Officials sent over to, on occasion of the King's visit, *May 12*, 1247, 1248.
Female Supervisors in, Discontinuance of, suggested, *May 3*, 259.
Inquiry into Grievances, proposed, *May 12*, 1251.
Learners in — Remuneration and Chances of Promotion, *May 12*, 1235.
Letters — Morning Delivery, delays, etc., *May 12*, 1233.
Northern District — Superintending Engineer's Staff — Rules as to Residence, *May 3*, 261.
Officials not included in Report of Committee of Inquiry, Opportunity for Discussion as to, *May 12*, 1219.
Press Messages, Delay in Transmission of, *May 12*, 1238.
Scully, Mr., Pension Grievance of, *May 12*, 1250.
Split Duties, Abolition of System, proposed, *May 12*, 1237.
Wages of Officials—Committee of Inquiry, Constitution of, *May 12*, 1233, 1234.
Woods, Mr., Pension Grievance of, *May 12*, 1249.
Registration of Clubs (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *May 6*, 666.
Taxation Surveyors, Clerks to, Establishing, as Permanent Civil Servants, *May 16*, 1371.

Natal
Volunteer Ambulance Corps — South African War Service — Granting Queen's Medals.
Q. Sir M. Bhownaggree; *A.* Mr. B. Davenport, *May 9*, 753.

National Debt
Funded and Unfunded Debts.
Position of.
O. Mr. Buchanan, *May 16*, 1475.
Reduction in—Statistics—References to, in Debate on the Finance Bill, *May 16*, 1435, 1436, 1475.

National Debt—*cont.*
Increase in, References to, in Debate, on the Finance Bill, *May 16*, 1435.
Law relating to, Amendment of, proposed —Resolution, *May 3*, 353.
Liabilities and Expenditure, etc., of the State, from 1835 to 1903, Return Presented, *May 4*, 372.
Reduction of.
Estimate of Sum to be Applied to, 1903-4—Sum actually applied.
Q. Mr. McCrae; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *May 2*, 99-100.
Local Loans Fund, Capital and Income of.
Accounts Presented, *May 9*, 739; *May 10*, 867.
References to, in Debate on the Finance Bill, *May 16*, 1435, 1436, 1446.
Return, Annual—Date of Publication.
Q. Mr. Buchanan; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *May 4*, 377.
Unclaimed Dividends on Government Stock.
Appropriation of, to Pay off Budget deficit.
Os. Mr. Dalziel, Mr. Whitley, *May 3*, 355; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 356, 357; Sir H. Fowler, 358; Mr. McCrae, 359; Sir J. Leng, Sir J. Joicey, Mr. Martin, 361, 362; Mr. H. Samuel, 363; Mr. Lough, 364.
Cancelling and Realising, Difference between.
Os. Sir J. Brunner, *May 3*, 357, 363; Mr. G. Bowles, 357; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 357, 363; Mr. Levy, 362; Mr. Weir, 364.
Efforts made to Discover the Owners.
Os. Sir J. Leng, Sir J. Joicey, *May 3*, 361; Mr. Martin, 362; Mr. Weir, 365.
Qs. Mr. Weir; *As.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *May 10*, 890, 891.

National Expenditure
see Revenue and Expenditure.

National School Teachers, Ireland
Assistant Teachers—Reduction of the Average from Sixty to Fifty—Date of coming into Effect.
Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 11*, 1022.
Salaries—Withholding Part, on account of Epidemic—Co. Meath School—Reconsidering Decision.
Q. Mr. S. Young; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 9*, 773.
School Attendance Committees, debarring Teachers from acting as Secretaries to.
Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 16*, 1372.

National Telephone Co.

Negotiations with the Post Office, Progress of.
O. Lord Stanley, *May 12*, 1223.

Tunbridge Wells, Charges at.
Q. Mr. G. Boscawen ; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 5*, 520–521.

Navy

First Lord—Earl of Selborne.

Financial Secretary—Mr. E. G. Pretyman.

Armaments, Reduction of, by means of Negotiations with Foreign Powers, proposed—References to, in debate on the Finance Bill, *May 16*, 1407, 1408, 1413, 1479.

Battleships.

First Class—Annual Cost of Maintenance in Commission.
Q. Mr. Harcourt ; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *May 6*, 646.

Life Limits of.
Q. Mr. Yerburgh ; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *May 16*, 1376–1377.

Speed Trials of, on the Cornish Coast, Damage to Fisheries by.
Q. Sir L. Molesworth ; *A.* Mr. A. Fellowes, *May 4*, 376.

Total number built 1900 and 1904 by Great Britain, France, and Germany.
Q. Mr. Yerburgh ; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *May 16*, 1376.

"Centurion," H.M.S.—Defective Condition of Gun Sights.
Q. Mr. Yerburgh ; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *May 2*, 95–97.

Chilian Battleships, Purchase of.

Date of Contract—Tabling Correspondence, etc.
Q. Mr. E. Robertson ; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *May 5*, 536.

Increase in Estimates due to, References to, in Debate on the Finance Bill, *May 16*, 1457, 1458, 1466.

Condition of, in 1895, etc.—References to, in Debate on the Finance Bill, *May 16*, 1413, 1418, 1419.

Expenditure on.

Growth of—References to, in Debate on the Finance Bill, *May 16*, 1403, 1404, 1407, 1408, 1414, 1424, 1431, 1432, 1449, 1455–1457, 1478, 1484, 1489.

Works Acts, under, Increase in, References to, in Debate on the Finance Bill, *May 16*, 1435, 1476.

Explosives used for Practice, Compensation for Damage by.
Q. Mr. R. Lucas ; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *May 3*, 243.

Flogging in—Weight of Birch used, etc.—Modifying Regulations.
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill ; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *May 4*, 380.

Navy—*cont.*

Foreign Navies.

Expenditure, apart from War Expenditure, of France, Germany, and Russia, in each of past Twenty-five years.
Q. Mr. Runciman ; *A.* Mr. Pretyman ; *May 13*, 1295-1296.

Shipbuilding Programmes.
Q. Sir J. Colomb ; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *May 16*, 1369–1370.

Qs. Mr. Yerburgh ; *As.* Mr. Pretyman, *May 16*, 1370, 1376.

Fraserburgh, suggested Establishment of Reserve Battery at.
Q. Mr. Maconochie ; *A.* Mr. A. Lee, *May 2*, 102-103.

Gun Sights of H.M.S. "Centurion," Defective Condition of.
Q. Mr. Yerburgh ; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *May 2*, 95-97.

Hydrographer's Report, presented, *Apr. 29*, 4, 12.

"Jackal," H.M.S.

North Sea Temperature, Cruises to ascertain—Amount of Captain's Remuneration.
Q. Mr. Weir ; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *May 10*, 889.

Police Duties of—Absence on Research Work — Appointing Substitute.
Q. Mr. Weir ; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *May 16*, 1377.

Light dues, payment of, by, proposed.
Qs. Mr. Rea, *May 13*, 1306 ; Sir A. Rollit, 1308 ; Mr. G. Bowles, 1311 ; Sir R. Ropner, 1321 ; Mr. Ritchie, 1332 ; Mr. Renwick, 1334 ; Sir J. Joicey, 1336 ; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 1350.

Paymasters-in-Chief — Commuted Allowance, Reason for Refusing Payment of.
Q. Mr. Skewes-Cox ; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *May 4*, 380–381.

Pensions.

Lawlor, John, increasing Pension of.
Q. Mr. Joyce ; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *May 11*, 1006.

Men of Sixty-five having done Campaign Service and in Receipt of Medal, Granting Pensions to.
Q. Sir C. Rasch ; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *May 13*, 1293-1294.

Prize Courts, Proceedings in—Administration of oaths by Captains, &c.
O. Earl of Halsbury, *May 9*, 734.

Prizes of War, introducing Bill consolidating Acts relating to.
Qs. Sir E. Durning-Lawrence, Mr. G. Bowles ; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *May 3*, 266.

[*cont.*

Navy—*cont.*
  Royal Naval Reserve.
    Age limit, Extension of, proposed.
      Os. Lord Muskerry, *May 6*, 635; Earl of Selborne, 636.
    Commander, Qualifications for rank of
      Os. Lord Muskerry, Earl of Selborne, *May 6*, 635.
    Increase in number of, proposed.
      O. Lord Brassey, *May 9*, 733.
  Shipbuilding.
    Battleships built 1900 and 1904—Total Number for Great Britain, France and Germany, etc.
      Q. Mr. Yerburgh; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *May 16*, 1376.
    Derry Yard, recommending, to a Share of Work.
      Q. Mr. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *May 12*, 1183–1184.
    Numbers, in various classes of Ships, building in England and Germany, 1894 and 1904.
      Q. Mr. Yerburgh; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *May 16*, 1370.
  Stores, Warlike, remaining in hand 31st Mar., 1880, 1890, 1900, and 1903, value of.
      Q. Mr. J. H. Lewis; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *May 12*, 1165.
  Submarine A1, Loss of—Cost of Salvage Operations—Result from Pneumatic System.
      Q. Sir J. Leng; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *May 2*, 97.
  Works Acts, Expenditure under, References to, in Debate on the Finance Bill, *May 16*, 1435, 1476.

Navy Estimates
  Discussion on, References to, in debate on the Finance Bill, *May 16*, 1417, 1422, 1456.
  Growth of, References to, in debate on the Finance Bill, *May 16*, 1403, 1404, 1407, 1408, 1414.

Neagh, Lough
  Drainage—Engineer's Report, publication of, etc.
      Q. Mr. C. Craig; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 16*, 1387.

Neath, Pontardawe, and Brynaman Railway Bill.
  l. Report from Select Committee, *Apr. 29*, 3
    3R.* *May 3*, 222.
  c. 1R.* *May 5*, 517.
    2R.* *May 16*, 1361.

Newcastle and Gateshead Water Bill
  l. Report from Select Committee, *May 5*, 493.

Newcastle-upon-Tyne Corporation Bill
  l. 3R.* *May 16*, 1358

Newchwang
  British Life and Property, Steps to safeguard—Request of British Consul for Despatch of Gunboat, etc.
      Qs. Mr. C. McArthur, Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Earl Percy, *May 11*, 1015–1016.

Newdigate, Mr. F. A. [Warwickshire Nuneaton]
  Bishoprics of Southwark and Birmingham Bill, 2R. *May 4*, 415.

New Guinea, British
  Disturbances in, reported.
    Inquiries, instituting.
      Q. The Master of Elibank; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 4*, 381–382.
    Statement, making.
      Q. The Master of Elibank; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 12*, 1164.

Newmarket
  Racing News distributed by Wireless Telegraphy—Prohibition.
      Q. Mr. Montagu; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 3*, 249.

New South Wales
  Birth Rate, Decline of—Tabling Committee Report.
      Q. Mr. D. A. Thomas; *A.* Mr Lyttelton, *Apr. 29*, 17.

Newspapers
  Canada, rates of postage to—granting increased facilities, proposed.
      Os. Sir J. Leng. *May 12*, 1228; Mr. H. C. Richards, 1231.
  Siberian Railway, arrangements as to transport of Newspapers during Russo-Japanese War.
      Os. Mr. L. Sinclair, *May 12*, 1224, Lord Stanley, 1256.

Newton, Lord
  Macedonian Crisis — Progress made in reforms, etc., *May 5*, 503.
  Street Betting Bill, 2R., *May 3*, 232.
  Com., *May 10*, 868, 873.

New York
  Trade Report presented, *May 13*, 1271.

New Zealand
  Immigration Regulations in.
      Q. Mr. Brigg; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 4*, 380.
  Preferential and Reciprocal Trade Act, 1903.
    Correspondence relating to, presented, *May 11*, 1004; *May 13*, 1271.

Nolan, Col. J. P. [Galway, N.]
  Ballinasloe Lunatic Asylum—Election of Dr. Kirwan, Delay in sanctioning, *May 16*, 647–648.
  India — Competitive Examinations for Public Services, Abolition of, Information as to, *May 5*, 535.

North Sea
  Temperature of, Cruises of "Jackal," to ascertain—Remuneration to Captain.
    Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *May 10*, 889.

North Wales Electric Power Bill
  l. Report from Select Committee, *May 13*, 1270.

North Western Electricity and Power Gas Bill
  c. Rep.* *May 6*, 641.

Norton, Captain C. W. [Newington, W.]
  Indian Army, Drafts for—Landing in the Hot Season, *May 5*, 533–534.
  Militia and Volunteers, Royal Commission on, Effect of War Office Reconstitution on Report of, *May 9*, 755.
  Post Office Sorters' Wages—Paying fortnightly, *May 9*, 761.
  St. James's Park—Repairing Paths, *May 16*, 1384.
  Woolwich Arsenal—Suspended Workmen—Payment of Bonuses, *May 5*, 534–535.

Norway
  Whalers in Scotch Waters, practice of throwing carcases out to sea—Steps taken to prevent, etc.
    Qs. Mr. C. Wason, *May 5*, 554; Mr. Asher, 563; Mr. Maconochie, 566; Mr. A. G. Murray, 568.

Norwich Water Bill
  l. 3R.* *May 2*, 74.

Nuneaton and Chilvers Coton Urban District Council Bill
  c. Rep.* *May 6*, 641.
  *Con.** *May 16*, 1361.

Nurses
  Army, Improvement in Pay of.
    Q. Dr. Farquharson; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *May 2*, 103.
  Registration of, by the State suggested.
    Q. Dr. Thompson; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *May 2*, 97–98.
  Workhouses, nursing of Sick Poor in—Committee Recommendations, issuing General Order consequent on
    Q. Sir Harry Samuel; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *May 16*, 1366.

O'Brien, Mr. J. F. X. [Cork]
  Post Office, Cork—Qualifications of Officer selected as Clerk, *May 16*, 1368.

O'Brien, Mr. K. [Tipperary, Mid.]
  Dundrum.
    Estate—Date of Fixing Hearing of Fair Rent Appeals, *May 16*, 1386.
    Petty Sessions — Appointing Additional Magistrates, *May 5*, 544.
  Thurles—Poor Law Outdoor Relief Refused by Local Government Board, alleged, *May 2*, 122.

O'Brien, Mr. P. [Kilkenny]
  Education—St. Patrick's Training College—Delay in Awarding Teaching Diplomas, *May 12*, 1161.

O'Brien, Mr. P. J. [Tipperary, N.]
  Borrisoleigh Band, Securing, from Police Interference—Relieving District from Burden of Extra Police, etc., *May 16*, 1394.

O'Connor, Mr. J. [Wicklow, W.]
  Arklow Harbour, Improvement of—Report of Board of Works Engineer, Circulation of, etc., *May 2*, 124.
  Avondale Estate, Wicklow, Purchasers of, *May 4*, 391.
  Post Office.
    Money Found on Counters, Disposal of, *Apr. 29*, 14.
    Postmasterships in Ireland given to English Officials and *vice versa*—Granting Return, *May 12*, 1154.
    Postmen, Rural, Employing, as Assistants to Sub-Postmasters in Spare Time—Regulations, *May 6*, 645.

O'Connor, Mr. T. P. [Liverpool, Scotland]
  Local Government (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill, 2R., *Apr. 29*, 53.

O'Doherty, Mr. W. [Donegal, S.]
  Buncrana and Carndonagh Railway, Appointment of Arbitrators, *Apr. 20*, 15.
  Fisheries, Ireland—Close Season off Donegal Coast, extending Area affected, *Apr. 29*, 16.
  Irish Society of London—Yearly Receipts and Expenditure, 1882 to 1904—Granting Return, *May 12*, 1159.
  Telephone System — Londonderry and Limavady Extension, Cause of Delay in commencing Works, *Apr. 29*, 14.

O'Donnell, Mr. T. [Kerry, W.]
  Dingle Union Fishery Piers—Sending Inspector to Report on Need for larger Piers, *May 11*, 1022-1023.
  Education.
    National School Teachers, Assistant—Reduction of the Average from Sixty to Fifty—Date of coming into Effect, *May 11*, 1022.
    School Attendance Committees, Reasons for Debarring Teachers from acting as Secretaries to, *May 16*, 1372.

[*cont.*

O'Donnell, Mr. T.—*cont.*
Kerry, Evicted Tenants in—Number of, and of Restorations under the Land Act of 1903, *May 12*, 1175-1176.
Pension Claims of Clerks in Irish County Surveyor's and Secretary's Offices, *May 16*, 1372.
Post Office—Sub-Postmasters, low rate of remuneration given to, *May 12*, 1262-1263.
Telephone Service — Tralee, extending trunk system to, *May 16*, 1367.

O'Dowd, Mr. J. [Sligo, S.]
Achonry.
Estate, purchase of, by Congested Districts Board, *May 2*, 121.
School Managers, *May 12*, 1175.
Dunn, Rev. B., P.P., Appointing, *May 9*, 767.
Collooney, Railway Tickets not issued for, from Sligo, alleged, *May 2*, 124.
Encumbered Estates, procedure for Inspection of, under Act, *May 2*, 120.
Florence Knox Estate, Mayo—Purchase of untenanted Lands by Estates Commissioners, *May 9*, 767.
Labourers Acts—Unexpended Balance of Exchequer Contribution, Application of, *May 9*, 766.
Weir Estate, Sligo, Administration of—Sale of Knocalassa Grazing Farm, *May 9*, 766.

Old Age Pensions
Aged Pensioners Bill, *see that title.*

Old Age Pensions (No. 3) Bill
c. Bill withdrawn, *May 6*, 700.

O'Malley, Mr. W. [Galway, Connemara]
Post Office, Connemara, Delays in Delivery of Letters, *May 12*, 1266.

O'Mara, Mr. J. [Kilkenny, S.]
Bishoprics of Southwark and Birmingham Bill, 2R., *May 4*, 433.
Foreign Ships trading to Ports in the United Kingdom — Applicability of Statutory requirement to, *May 4*, 459.

Omnibus Drivers and Conductors
Licences of—Suspension by Police Authority.
Q. Mr. Lough; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *May 3*, 240.

O'Neill, Mr. R. T. [Antrim, Mid.]
Registration of Clubs (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *May 6*, 648, 660.

Onslow, Earl of—*President of the Board of Agriculture.*
Sea Fisheries Bill, 3R., *May 2*, 85.

Open Spaces Bill
l. 2R.* *May 5*, 499.

Orange River Colony
Census Return—Date of.
Qs. Major Seely; *As.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 2*, 107.
Civil Service Estimates, Class 5, Total Sum expended under, 1901-2 and 1902-3.
Q. Mr. Rea; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 12*, 1158-1159.
Natives—Repatriation after the War.
Q. Mr. H. Craig; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 5*, 532-533.

Orkney
Fisheries — Crown and Private Rights, Settlement of.
Os. Mr. C. Wason, *May 5*, 555; Mr. A. G. Murray, 588.
Mails, Irregularities in Delivery of.
O. Mr. C. Wason, *May 12*, 1262.
Qs. Mr. C. Wason; *As.* Lord Stanley, *May 10*, 892, 893.
Road Construction in—Delay on part of the Congested Districts Board.
O. Mr. C. Wason, *May 5*, 553.

Ormsby-Gore, Mr. G. R. C. [Shropshire, Oswestry]
Banbridge, disturbances at—Police Interference, *May 11*, 1020.
Constabulary, Royal Irish, Compensation for Injuries done by—Case of Mr. W. M'Gifford, *May 5*, 530-531.
France—Arbitration Treaty with Great Britain—Date of Discussion, *May 3*, 266.
South African War—Imperial Yeomanry and Volunteers, number of, during War, *May 2*, 105.

O'Shaughnessy, Mr. P. J. [Limerick, W.]
Cork Prison Infirmary — Death of M. Curtin — Coroner's Jury's Verdict — Inquiring into conduct of Resident Magistrate, etc., *May 11*, 1024, 1025; *May 16*, 1392.
Labourers' Cottages, Return relating to, cause of delay in publication of, *May 16*, 1388.
Labourers (Ireland) Bill.
Cottage Scheme, Expense of, under, *May 4*, 392.
Compensation Clause, Inserting, *May 4*, 392-393.
Maximum Rating Limit, Question of increasing—Application of unexpended Balance of Exchequer contribution, *May 4*, 392.
Pallaskenry, alleged offensive Notice exhibited in—Steps to prevent Exhibition, *May 9*, 770; *May 11*, 1026.
Post Office—Appointment of M. Finnerty to vacancy in Telegraph Department, *May 16*, 1395.
Sale of Butter Bill, proceeding with—Date of Second Reading, *May 4*, 396.

Outdoor Relief (Friendly Societies) Bill
Financial character of Bill—breach of privilege in originating in House of Lords.
Os. Earl of Halsbury, *May 5*, 496, 498; Lord Monkswell, 496, 499; Earl Spencer, 498.

Outdoor Relief (Friendly Societies) (No. 3) Bill
c. 1R* *May 6*, 700.

Oxford University
Statutes made by Governing Body presented, *Apr. 29*, 4, 12.

Pallaskenry
Notice offensive to Roman Catholics exhibited in—Steps to prevent Exhibition, etc.,
Q. Mr. O'Shaughnessy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 9*, 770.
Qs. Mr. O'Shaughnessy, Mr. Joyce, Mr. Lundon; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 11*, 1026.

Palmer, Sir C. M. [Durham, Jarrow]
Mail steamers, Search of, by Belligerents—Postal letters as Contraband of War, etc., *May 10*, 893.

Parcel Post
see under Post Office.

Paris
Postal Service between London and—Late Letter Posting—Granting London same Facilities as Paris,
Q. Mr. Pirie; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 6*, 645.

Parks and Gardens
Rules presented, *Apr. 29*, 4, 11.
St. James's Park—Repairing Paths
Q. Capt. Norton; *A.* Lord Balcarres, *May 16*, 1384.
Kew Gardens, Lot's Eyot facing Entrance to, Proposed barge-dock on—Making Protests.
Q. Mr. Skewes-Cox; *A.* Mr. A. Fellowes, *May 12*, 1156–1157.

Parliament
House of Commons
Adjournment of—Motion for, being an abuse of the Rules, Refusal of Speaker to propose the Question, *May 3*, 367.
Business of the House, *see that title.*
Committees—Ascension Day—Committees not to sit until Two of the Clock.
Motion (Mr. A. J. Balfour), *May 11*, 1030.
Members, *see* Members of Parliament.

Parliament—*cont.*
House of Commons—*cont.*
Ministerial Office, Introducing Bill removing Necessity for Re-election on accepting,
Qs. Mr. F. Ridley, Sir C. Dilke, Mr. W. Redmond; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *May 3* 266–267.
Standing Orders, *see that title.*
Vote Office, Ventilation of, Use of coal fire, etc.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Lord Balcarres, *May 2*, 117.
House of Lords.
Adjournment for Whitsuntide recess.
Os. Earl Spencer, Marquess of Lansdowne, *May 6*, 637.
Fee Fund—Account presented, *May 13*, 1273.
Financial Bill, Breach of Privilege in originating
Os. Earl of Halbury, *May 5*, 496, 498; Lord Monkswell, 496, 499; Earl Spencer, 498.
Journal Committee—Report presented, *May 5*, 494.
Peers, Roll of, Presentation proposed, at beginning of each Session,
Os. Earl of Belmore, *May 13*, 1287, 1288; Marquess of Lansdowne, 1287.
Sat first—Earl of Chichester after the death of his brother, *May 16*, 1357.

Parliamentary Elections
Absentee Electors, Arranging to record Votes of.
Q. Sir E. Lees; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *May 9*, 775–776.

Parliamentary Voters (Registration) Bill
c. 1R.* *May 9*, 778.

Patents
British, Compulsory Licenses for—Total Number, etc.
Q. Sir J. Leng; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *May 3*, 241.

Patents, Designs and Trade Marks
Report presented, *May 13*, 1273; *May 16*, 1363.

Paupers
Ireland, Deportation to—Case of Frank Milner.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 10*, 896, 897; *May 12*, 1178.

Powerscourt Estate
Fair Rent Appeals—Date of completing Cases.
Q. Mr. T. W. Russell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 12*, 1152.

Pease, Mr. J. A. [Essex, Saffron Walden]
- Acreage of Wheat, Barley and Total Corn 1849–1853 and 1899–1903, in England, Scotland and Ireland, with Produce and Average Price, *May 9*, 742.
- Licensing Bill—Compensation, Time Limit for claiming — Inserting Amending Clause, etc., *May 11*, 1028.
- Little Canfield; Refusal of Vicar of, to read Burial Service, *May 16*, 1364.

Pease, Mr. H. P. [Darlington]
- Kent Water Company—Well at Darenth, Liability of, to Pollution—Instituting Inquiry, *May 12*, 1171.

Peel, Mr. W. R. [Manchester, S.]
- Licensed Premises—Valuation for Estate Duty, Method of, *May 2*, 100.
- Licensing Bill, 2R., *May 9*, 859; *May 10*, 899.

Peers
- *see* Parliament—House of Lords.

Pekin
- Railway Syndicate—Negotiations with the Chinese Government.
  - *Q.* Mr. Yerburgh; *A.* Earl Percy, *May 12*, 1157.

Penny Postage
- *see under* Post Office.

Pensions
- Aged Pensioners Bill, *see that title.*
- Civil Service Clerks, Temporary, Arrangements as to.
  - *Q.* Mr. Thornton; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *May 2*, 91–92.
- Clerks in Irish County Surveyor's and Secretary's Offices, Claims of.
  - *Q.* Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 16*, 1372–1373.
- Constabulary, Royal Irish—Case of Sergeant Gallagher.
  - *Q.* Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 9*, 765.
- Naval.
  - Lawlor, John, Increasing Pension of.
    - *Q.* Mr. Joyce; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *May 11*, 1006.
  - Men of sixty-five, having done Campaign Service and in Receipt of Medal, Granting Pensions to.
    - *Q.* Sir C. Rasch; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *May 13*, 1293–1294.
- Post Office, *see under* Post Office.

Percy, Earl—*Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs*, [Kensington, S.]
- Budapest, Lottery Drawings at—Postage of Circulars in London—Instituting Inquiries, *May 9*, 744.

Percy, Earl—*cont.*
- China.
  - Newchwang—British Life and Property, Steps to Safeguard, etc., *May 11*, 1016.
  - Pekin Syndicate Railways — Negotiations with the Chinese Government, *May 12*, 1157.
- Congo Free State.
  - Administration of — Communications to Signatories of Berlin Act—Replies received and Date of Tabling, *May 11*, 1017.
  - Atrocities, alleged—Letter from Belgian Consul-General at Liverpool, Steps to be taken regarding, *May 9*, 750.
  - Jones, Silvanus, Sentence passed on, Steps to be taken as to, *May 5*, 758.
- France — Arbitration Treaty with Great Britain—Siam, French Treaty with—Terms recognised by Anglo-French Agreement—*Status* of Protected Subjects, etc., *May 12*, 1169.
- Macedonia.
  - Conference of Insurgent Leaders — Steps to reassure the Populace, *May 3*, 248.
  - Gendarmerie, Re-organisation of — Authority of European Officers, *May 4*, 382.
  - Monastir, European Consuls at—Representations ignored by the Vali, *May 3*, 247.
- Smoke Nuisance, Foreign Legislation as to—Tabling Reports proposed, *May 16*, 1381.
- Somaliland.
  - British Garrison for—Strength, etc., *May 2*, 110.
  - Campaign.
    - Cost of—Total Cost prior to 1st Oct. 1902, *May 13*, 1296.
    - Illig, Capture of.
      - Continuance of Operations, etc., *May 2*, 110.
      - Co-operation of Italian Squadron, *May 9*, 759.
    - Mijertain Tribe.
      - Mullah attacked by, *May 2*, 109, 110.
      - Strength of — Strength of Mullah's Forces, *May 4* 383.
    - Mullah, Position of—Rifles and Ammunition Captured, etc., *May 12*, 1170.
- Tibet Expedition — Russia, Communications with, since Nov. 17, 1903—Tabling Papers, *May 11*, 1015.

Petitions
- Report of Committee presented, *May 4*, 397.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill
l. 2R.* *May.6,* 634.
Com.* *May 13,* 1271 ; *May 16,* 1358.

Piers and Harbours
Devonshire and Cornwall, Harbours of Refuge in, Utility of—Capt. Frederick's Report.
Q. Mr. Soares ; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *May 5,* 521.
Ireland.
Arklow Harbour, Improvement of—Circulation of Report of Board of Works Engineer, etc.
Qs. Mr. J. O'Connor, Mr. J. Redmond ; *As.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *May 2,* 124.
Baltimore Harbour — Condition of Beacon.
Q. Mr. Gilhooly ; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *May 2,* 125,
Courtown Harbour, Dredging Entrance to.
Q. Sir T. Esmonde ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 9,* 763.
Additional Dredger, providing.
Q. Sir T. Esmonde ; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *May 12,* 1160.
Dingle Union, Need for Larger Piers in—Sending Inspector to Report.
Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 11,* 1022-1023.
Dredgers.
Additional for the South East Coast, Provision of.
Q. Sir T. Esmonde ; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *May 12,* 1160.
Development Grant, Provision from.
Q. Mr. Kilbride ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 12,* 1174, 1175.
Dunleary, Old Harbour of—Sale of Portion of Foreshore, Minute presented, *May 4,* 372 ; *May 5,* 495.
Falchorrib Pier—Date of Commencing Work.
Q. Mr. H. Law ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 3,* 253-254,
Fishing Piers on South-East Coast—Improvement of.
Q. Sir T. Esmonde ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 4,* 390.
Gortnasate Pier—Date of commencing Work.
Q. Mr. H. Law ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 3,* 253-254.
Valentia Harbour, Telegraph Office at, continuing, during the Fishery Season.
Qs. Mr. Boland, Mr. Flavin ; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 12,* 1183.

Piers and Harbours—*cont.*
Scotland—Avoch—Government Grant for Harbour.
Qs. Mr. Weir ; *As.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *May 5,* 525 ; *May 16,* 1364.
Q. Mr. Weir ; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *May 10,* 894.

Pirie, Mr. D. V. [Aberdeen, N.]
Jameson Raid — Chartered Company's Liability for Payment of Indemnity, *May 3,* 245-246.
Postal Service between London and Paris—Late Letter Posting—Granting London same Facilities as Paris, *May 6,* 645.
Wild Birds Protection Act, Publishing clearer Notices under, *May 13,* 1294.

Plague
Hong-Kong, at—Postponing Introduction of Chinese into the Transvaal during the Prevalence of, etc.
Qs. Mr. Weir, Sir W. Foster, Mr. Buchanan ; *As.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 9,* 756-757.
Rats, spread by means of—Fumigating Vessels from Plague-infected Ports.
Q. Sir T. Dewar ; Mr. W. Long, *May 3,* 250.

Plummer, Mr. W. R. [Newcastle-on Tyne]
Lights and Lighthouses—Expenditure and Dues Collected during Year ended 31st Mar., 1904, *May 10,* 886.
Merchant Shipping (Lighthouses) Bill, 2R., *May 13,* 1299, 1304.

Plymouth Corporation Bill
c. Con.* *May 9,* 736.
3R.* *May 12,* 1146.
l. 1R.* *May 13,* 1271.

Police
Constabulary, Royal Irish, *see that title.*
Tyne Police Force, Refusal of Certificate to, under Act of 1890.
Correspondence presented, *May 6,* 634, 643.

Police Superannuation Bill
c. Rep.* *May 3,* 270.

Polling Districts
Middlesex, County of — County Council Order Altering Certain Polling Districts, presented, *May 9,* 703, 738.

Poor Law
Administration of, Improvements in System of, During last fifty years.
Qs. Mr. W. Long, *May 6,* 694, 696 ; Sir W. Foster, 698.
Inspectors—Highland Crofting Counties, Age Limit and Medical Inspection for Appointments in.
Q. Mr. Weir ; *A.* Mr. S. Dickson, *May 12,* 1172.

[*cont.*

Poor Law—*cont.*

Institutions, Corporal Punishment in, Regulation of.
Q. Sir W. Foster, *May 10*, 887; *A.* Mr. W. Long, 888.

Ireland.

Deportation of F. Milner from Derby to Mountmellick Union.
Qs. Mr. Delany; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 10*, 896; *May 12*, 1178.

Medical Officers, Commission to Investigate Grievances of.
Q. Dr. Thompson; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *Apr. 29*, 12–13.

Thurles—Refusal of Outdoor Relief by Local Government Board, alleged.
Q. Mr. K. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 2*, 122, 123.

Paupers, Total Number of, Inclusive of Vagrants and Lunatics—Statistics for 1903.
O. Mr. W. Long, *May 6*, 695.

Poplar (Providence Place) Improvement Scheme, 1890

Modifications in — Statement Presented, *May 6*, 634, 643.

Portmadoc, Beddgelert, and South Snowdon Railway Bill

l. 3R.* *May 16*, 1357.

Port of London Bill

Carrying over from one Session to Another —"Special Standing Order for the Session 1904," Character and Duration of.
Os. Mr. G. Bowles, Mr. Speaker, *May 9*, 777, 778.

Proceedings on, Resumption of—Motion (Mr. G. Balfour), *May 11*, 1142.
Os. Mr. J. Ellis, Sir A. Acland-Hood, *May 11*, 1143, 1144.

Qs. Mr. G. Bowles; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *May 4*, 396–397; *May 11*, 1029.

Post Cards, Postage, Postal Orders, Postmasters

see under Post Office.

Post Office

Postmaster-General—Lord Stanley.

Australia, Penny Post to, Negotiations as to.
Os. Lord Stanley, *May 12*, 1223; Mr. H. Heaton, 1225; Sir J. Leng, 1228; Mr. H. C. Richards, 1231.

Blunders of, Granting Compensation for.
O. Mr. H. Heaton, *May 12*, 1227.

Canada, Newspapers, etc., Facilitating Introduction of, into.
Os. Sir J. Leng, *May 12*, 1128; Mr. Slack, 1266.

Post Office—*cont.*

Cash on Delivery System, Introduction of.
Os. Mr. Hemphill, *May 12*, 1224; Mr. C. Wason, 1261.

Q. Lord Willoughby de Eresby; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 3*, 241; *Q.* Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 4*, 373.

Comparison of Present Day Organisation, Facilities and Charges with those 230 years ago.
Os. Mr. W. Rutherford, *May 12*, 1251, 1252; Mr. T. Taylor, 1264.

Copyists, Promotion of, to Assistant Clerkships—Compulsory Retirement of Senior Assistant Clerk.
Q. Mr. Thornton; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 2*, 91–92.

District Messenger Service—Telephone attachment to dials, refusal of Post Office to sanction.
Os. Col. Lockwood, *May 12*, 1260; Lord Stanley, 1267.

Dual Workers, objections to system.
Os. Mr. Nannetti, *May 12*, 1236, 1255; Lord Stanley, 1254, 1255.

Egypt—Penny Post, extension of, to, proposed.
Os. Mr. H. Heaton, *May 12*, 1228; Mr. H. C. Richards, 1232.

Ireland.

Baltimore, affording Second Post at.
Q. Mr. Gilhooly; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 3*, 262–263.

Belturbet New Office—Local Objection to One Storey Building — Reconsidering Plans.
Q. Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 3*, 262.

Castletown, Berehaven, improved Facilities for.
Q. Mr. Gilhooly; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 5*, 519–520.

Connemara, delays in delivery of letters.
O. Mr. O'Malley, *May 12*, 1266.

Cork Office, Clerk at—Qualifications of Officer Selected, etc.
Q. Mr. J. F. X. O'Brien; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 16*, 1368–1369.

Cummeen, granting increased Facilities to.
Q. Mr. Murphy; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 16*, 1366–1367.

Dublin.

Extra Officials sent over from England on occasion of the King's visit, grievances as to.
O. Mr. Nannetti, *May 12*, 1247, 1248.

Female Supervisors, Discontinuance of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Nannetti; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 3*, 259.

Post Office—*cont.*
Ireland—*cont*
Ferns Postmaster — Appointment of Liverpool Town Postman — Qualifications for Post, etc.
Q. Sir T. Esmonde; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 12*, 1153–1154.
Inquiry into grievances, proposed.
O. Mr. Nannetti, *May 12*, 1251.
Irish Language, requiring knowledge of.
Qs. Mr. Boland; *As.* Lord Stanley, *May 3*, 260–261.
Kilrush Postmastership—Applications from Members of Irish Service, etc.
Q. Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 13*, 1294.
Knocknagoshel, County Kerry, Sunday Delivery at.
Q. Mr. Murphy; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 9*, 774–775.
Leamyglissane, arranging for Daily Delivery at.
Q. Mr. Murphy; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 16*, 1366–1367.
Learners.
Londonderry Office — Situations for qualified learners.
Q. Mr. Wood; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 11*, 1007–1008.
Remuneration and chances of promotion.
Os. Mr. Nannetti, *May 12*, 1235; Lord Stanley, 1254.
Londonderry Office.
Alterations proposed, Date of commencing, etc.
Q. Mr. Wood; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 11*, 1008.
Learners, Qualified, without Appointments, Providing Situations for, etc.
Q. Mr. Wood; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 11*, 1007–1008.
Longford — Night Work, Arrangements as to.
Q. Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 3*, 263.
Moy, Co. Tyrone—Restoring Morning Mail Service.
Q. Mr. T. W. Russell; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May* 5, 520.
Northern District — Superintending Engineer's Staff—Rules as to Residence.
Q. Mr. Nannetti; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 3*, 261.
Split duties, Abolition of system, proposed.
O. Mr. Nannetti, *May 12*, 1237.

Post Office—*cont.*
Ireland—*cont.*
Templetown, providing increased Facilities for.
Q. Mr. Ffrench; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 3*, 261-262.
Learners.
Female, Appointment of, on the Establishment.
Q. Sir J. Leng; *A.* Lord Stanley *May 2*, 92.
Londonderry Office, Qualified Learners in, without appointments—Providing Situations for, etc.
Q. Mr. Wood; *A.* Lord Stanley *May 11*, 1007–1008.
Promotion and remuneration of.
Os. Sir J. Leng, *May 12*, 1229 Mr. Nannetti, 1235; Lord Stanley, 1254.
Letter boxes, Placing, in through trains proposed.
Os. Mr. H. Heaton, *May 12*, 1227 Mr. H. C. Richards, 1231.
Letters.
Connemara, delays in delivery in.
O. Mr. O'Malley, *May 12*, 1266.
Halfpenny postage—Examination o Letters by Officials.
O. Mr. H. C. Richards, *May 12*, 1230.
Insufficient postage, Abolition o heavy fines for, proposed.
O. Mr. H. Heaton, *May 12* 1226.
Morning delivery, Delay in.
Os. Mr. H. Heaton, *May 12*, 1227 Mr. Nannetti, Lord Stanley 1233.
Recall of letters posted by mistake Relaxing rules as to, proposed.
Os. Mr. H. Heaton, *May 12* 1227; Lord Stanley, 1256.
Registration fee, reduction of, pro posed.
O. Mr. H. Heaton, *May 12*, 1226
Sunday deliveries, Objections to.
O. Mr. C. Wason, *May 12*, 1261.
London Offices—Insanitary condition o Smithfield Market and Great Towe Street Branch Offices—Obtaining Report.
Q. Mr. Bayley; *A.* Lord Stanley *May 12*, 1170–1171.
London and Paris, Service between—Lat Letter posting—Granting London th same facilities as Paris.
Q. Mr. Pirie; *A.* Lord Stanley *May 6*, 645.
Lottery Circulars, Powers of the Post Offic to Suppress.
Os. Mr. H. Heaton, *May 12*, 1227 Lord Stanley, 1255, 1260; Mr C. Wason, 1260, 1261.

[*cont.*

Post Office—*cont.*
- Magazines, high rates of postage charged for.
  - *Os.* Mr. H. Heaton, *May 12*, 1228; Mr. Slack, 1266.
  - Canada, rates to.
    - *O.* Mr. Slack, *May 12*, 1266.
- Mail Service.
  - American Mail landed at Queenstown, Sorting of, etc.
    - *Qs.* Mr. Nannetti, Capt. Donelan; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 3*, 259, 260.
  - Eastern.
    - Committee of Inquiry.
      - Constitution and terms of reference.
        - *Q.* Mr. E. Cecil, *May 2*, 111; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, 112.
      - Report.
        - Presented *May 16*, 1363.
        - Tabling, proposed, etc.
          - *Os.* Mr. C. Hay, Lord Stanley, *May 12*, 1265, 1268.
          - *Q.* Mr. E. Cecil; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 16*, 1381.
    - India, Contribution from.
      - *Q.* Mr. Buchanan, *May 2*, 112; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, 112.
  - Orkney, delays in transit of mails, reasons for.
    - *O.* Mr. C. Wason, *May 12*, 1262.
    - *Qs.* Mr. C. Wason; *As.* Lord Stanley, *May 10*, 892, 893.
  - Steamers, search of, by belligerents—Postal letters as contraband of war, etc.
    - *Q.* Sir C. Palmer; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 10*, 893.
- Money found on Counters, Disposal of.
  - *Q.* Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Lord Stanley, *April 29*, 14.
- Money Orders.
  - Delivery of money at payee's address, proposed.
    - *O.* Mr. H. Heaton, *May 12*, 1226.
  - England to France, rate charged for.
    - *O.* Mr. H. Heaton, *May 12*, 1226.
  - Limit of Extension of, to £40.
    - *O.* Lord Stanley, *May 12*, 1222.
- Motor Services of, extension of.
  - *Os.* Lord Stanley, *May 12*, 1221; Mr. L. Sinclair, 1224; Mr. Weir, 1259.
- Newspapers.
  - Canada, introduction into, granting increased facilities for.
    - *Os.* Sir J. Leng, *May 12*, 1228; Mr. H. C. Richards, 1231.

Post Office—*cont.*
- Newspapers—*cont.*
  - Siberian route, arrangements as to carriage by railway during Russo-Japanese War.
    - *Os.* Mr. L. Sinclair, *May 12*, 1224; Lord Stanley, 1256.
- Parcel Post—Foreign countries, rates to and from.
  - Anomalies of—Appointment of Departmental Committee to inquire into, proposed.
    - *Os.* Mr. T. Taylor, *May 12*, 1264; Lord Stanley, 1267.
  - Lowering proposed, to compete with other European countries.
    - *Q.* Mr. Toulmin; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 11*, 1007.
- Pensions.
  - Scully, Mr., Grievance of.
    - *Os.* Mr. Nannetti, *May 12*, 1250; Lord Stanley, 1255.
  - Woods, Mr., Grievance of.
    - *Os.* Mr. Nannetti, *May 12*, 1249; Lord Stanley, 1255.
- Postcards, communications on face of—Extending regulations as to inland, to all postcards, proposed.
  - *O.* Mr. H. C. Richards, *May 12*, 1231.
- Postage.
  - Halfpenny,
    - Anomalies of,
      - *O.* Mr. H. C. Richards, *May 12*, 1231.
    - Commercial Matter, Extension to.
      - *O.* Lord Stanley, *May 12*, 1221.
    - Letters examined and delayed by Officials.
      - *O.* Mr. H. C. Richards, *May 12*, 1230.
    - Letters, Extension to, proposed.
      - *O.* Mr. H. C. Richards, *May 12*, 1233.
    - Local posts, establishment of, proposed.
      - *O.* Mr. T. Taylor, *May 12*, 1264.
  - Insufficient, Abolition of heavy fines for, proposed.
    - *O.* Mr. H. Heaton, *May 12*, 1226.
  - Magazines, high rates charged for.
    - *Os.* Mr. H. Heaton, *May 12*, 1228; Mr. Slack, 1266.
  - Penny.
    - Australia—Negotiations as to.
      - *Os.* Lord Stanley, *May 12*, 1223; Mr. H. Heaton, 1225; Sir J. Leng, 1228; Mr. H. C. Richards, 1231.
    - Egypt, inclusion of, proposed.
      - *Os.* Mr. H. Heaton, *May 12*, 1228; Mr. H. C. Richards, 1232.

Post Office—*cont.*
Postage—*cont.*
Penny—*cont.*
Universal Post, Efforts made to establish.
Os. Mr. H. Heaton, *May 12*, 1225; Lord Stanley, 1258.
Postal Orders.
Fines on, Anomalies of.
Os. Mr. H. Heaton, *May 12*, 1226; Lord Stanley, 1256
Interchanging with the Colonies, Negotiations as to.
O. Lord Stanley, *May 12*, 1221.
New denominations of, Success of.
O. Lord Stanley, *May 12*, 1222.
Postmasters.
English Officials appointed to Irish Posts and *vice versâ*, Granting Return as to.
Q. Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 12*, 1154.
Ferns, Appointment of Liverpool Town Postman at—Qualifications for post, etc.
Q. Sir T. Esmonde; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 12*, 1153-1154.
Kilrush, Appointment at—Applications for Members of Irish Service, etc.
Q. Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 13*, 1294.
Southport Office, Appointment of son of Postmaster in—Rule as to relatives in same office.
Q. Mr. Goddard; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 12*, 1154.
Sub-postmasters.
Assistance to—Employment of Rural Postmen, Regulations for.
Q. Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 6*, 645.
Remuneration of, low rate of.
O. Mr. T. O'Donnell, *May 12*, 1262-1263.
Postmen, Rural, employing, as Assistants to sub-Postmasters in spare time—Regulations.
Q. Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 6*, 645.
Profits made by, application of, to bettering conditions of service, etc.
O. Mr. W. Rutherford. *May 12*, 1252, 1253.
Promotions—Favoritism in filling up appointments, alleged.
Os. Mr. Nannetti, *May 12*, 1238-1240; Lord Stanley, 1253, 1254.

Post Office—*cont.*
Rural and Local Offices, extra work i posed on Employees during times pressure.
O. Mr. H. C. Richards, *May 1* 1232.
Samples, Restrictions on Conveyance of—Granting increased facilities, propose
O. Mr. H. Heaton, *May 12*, 1226.
Sanitary arrangements, defects in.
Os. Mr. Bayley, *May 12*, 1257; Lo Stanley, 1257, 1258.
Q. Mr. Bayley; *A.* Lord Stanle *May 12*, 1170–1171.
Scotland.
Dundee Deliverers, condition of wor inadequacy in numbers, etc. D lay in reply to memorial as to.
O. Sir J. Leng, *May 12*, 1229.
Orkney Mail Service, delays in, reaso for.
O. Mr. C. Wason, *May 12*, 1262.
Qs. Mr. C. Wason; *As.* Lord Sta ley, *May 10*, 892, 893.
Sorters' Wages—Paying fortnightly.
Q. Capt. Norton; *A.* Lord Stanle *May 9*, 761.
Southport Office, Appointment of Pos master's Son in—Rule as to Relativ in same Office.
Q. Mr. Goddard; *A.* Lord Stanle *May 12*, 1154.
Split Duties, abolition of system, propose
O. Mr. Nannetti, *May 12*, 1237.
Stamps.
Country of origin, indicating, pr posed.
O. Mr. H. Heaton, *May 12*, 1227.
Foreign, facilities for purchase of, the General Post Office, propose
O. Mr. H. Heaton, *May 1* 1227.
International, necessity for.
O. Mr. H. Heaton, *May 12*, 1227.
Issue of, in book form.
Charge for, objections to, o ground of inconvenience.
O. Lord Stanley, *May 12*, 122
Higher denominations, propose issue of.
O. Lord Stanley, *May 1* 1222.
Superannuation—Provision for Employee not benefited by the Superannuatio Act.
Os. Lord Stanley, *May 12*, 1222 Mr. Weir, 1259.
Telegraph and Telephone Services, *se those titles.*
Wages of Officials, Committee of Inquir into.
Constitution of, omission of represen tative of the working classes, etc
O. Mr. Nannetti, *May 12*, 123 1234.

[*cont.*

Post Office—*cont.*
- Wages of Officials, Committe of Inquiry into—*cont.*
  - Report of.
    - Discussing, on the Telegraphs and Telephones Vote, proposed.
      - *Os.* Lord Stanley, *May 12*, Mr. Deputy-Chairman, 1218, 1219; Mr. Nannetti, 1219.
    - Officials not included in, Discussion as to.
      - *Os.* Mr. Nannetti, Lord Stanley, *May 12*, 1219; Mr. C. Hay, 1265.
    - Presenting to the House and affording facilities for Discussion of.
      - *Os.* Lord Stanley, *May 12*, 1217; Mr. Bayley, Sir A. Rollit, 1218; Mr. Nannetti, 1219.
      - *Q.* Mr. C. Hay; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 3*, 249.
    - Subjects dealt with in.
      - *Os.* Sir A. Rollit, *May 12*, 1219; Mr. W. Rutherford, Lord Stanley, 1220.
- Wireless Telegraphy, *see that title.*

Power, Mr. P. J. [Waterford, E.]
- Waterford, Evicted Tenants in—Applications for Re-instatement — Granting Return, *May 5*, 531.

President of the Board of Agriculture
- *Earl of Onslow.*

President of the Board of Education
- *Marquess of Londonderry.*

President of the Board of Trade
- *Mr. Gerald W. Balfour.*

President of the Local Government Board
- *Mr. Walter H. Long.*

Preston and Blackburn Tramways Bill
- *c.* 2R.* *May 4*, 369.

Preston Corporation Water Bill
- *l.* Rep.* *May 5*, 493.
  - 3R.* *May 16*, 1358.

Pretyman, Capt. E. G., *Secretary to the Admiralty* [Suffolk, Woodbridge]
- Battleships.
  - Construction of, by Great Britain, France and Germany for 1900 and 1904, etc., *May 16*, 1376.
  - First Class—Annual Cost of Maintenance in Commission, *May 6*, 646.
  - Life Limits of, *May 16*, 1376, 1377.
- "Centurion," H.M.S., Gun Sights of, *May 2*, 97.
- Coastguard Service—Inspection of Dwellings under Health Acts, *May 10*, 890.

Pretyman, Capt. E. G.—*cont.*
- Explosives used for Practice, Compensation for Damage by, *May 3*, 243.
- Flogging—Weight of Birch used, etc.—Modifying Regulations, *May 4*, 380.
- France, Germany and Russia, Expenditure of, Apart from War Expenditure, in each of the past Twenty-five Years, *May 13*, 1295-1296.
- "Jackal" H.M.S.
  - North Sea Temperature, Cruises to ascertain—Remuneration of Captain, *May 10*, 889.
  - Police Duties of—Substitute Proposed during Absence on Research Work, *May 16*, 1377.
- Paymasters-in-Chief—Commuted Allowance, Reason for Refusing Payment of, *May 4*, 381.
- Pensions.
  - Lawlor, John, Suggested Increase for, *May 11*, 1006.
  - Men of Sixty-five having done Campaign Service and holding Medal, Granting to, *May 13*, 1294.
- Shipbuilding.
  - Battleships built in 1900 and 1904 by Great Britain, and France and Germany combined, etc., *May 16*, 1376.
  - Derry Yard, Recommending, to a Share of Work, *May 12*, 1183-1184.
  - German Programme of 1900, Adherence to, *May 16*, 1370.
  - Number of Vessels in course of Construction in England and Germany 1894 and 1904, *May 16*, 1370.
- Stores, Warlike, Remaining in hand 31st March, 1880, 1890, 1900 and 1903, Value of, *May 12*, 1165.
- Submarine A.1, Loss of—Cost of Salvage Operations—Result from Pneumatic System, *May 2*, 97.

Prevention of Corruption Bill
- *l. Com.*, *May 9*, 734.

Prime Minister
- *Mr. A. J. Balfour.*

Printing and Stationery
- Expenditure on, Increase in.
  - *O.* Sir G. Bartley, *May 16*, 1453.

Prisons
- Aliens in British, Number of.
  - *Q.* Sir T. Dewar; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *April 29*, 14.
- Barbados—Amended Rules Presented, *May 2*, 76, 89.
- Cork Infirmary—Death of Michael Curtin—Coroner's Jury's Verdict—Inquiring into Conduct of Resident Magistrate, etc.
  - *Qs.* Mr. O'Shaughnessy, Mr. Sheehan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 11*, 1024-1026.

[*cont.*

Prisons—*cont.*

Dartmoor—Staff Quarters, Inadequacy of.
Q. Mr. C. Hay; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *May 3*, 251.

Scotland—Inverness, Constitution of Visiting Committee to.
Rule Presented, *May 11*, 1004; *May 13*, 1272.

Privilege, Breach of

Church of England Temperance Society, Circular issued by, to Members of Parliament—Introduction of King's Name into.
Os. Major Jameson, Mr. Speaker, *May 9*, 776–777.

Financial Bills, Introduction of, in House of Lords—Outdoor Relief (Friendly Societies) Bill
Os. Earl of Halsbury, *May 5*, 496, 498; Lord Monkswell, 496, 499; Earl Spencer, 498.

Prize Courts Bill
l. 2R., *May 9*, 734.
*Com.** *May 16*, 1359.

Provisional Order (Marriages) Bill
c. 2R., *May 3*, 366.

Public Accounts Committee
Report Presented, *Apr. 29*, 72.

Public Loans Act
Local Loans—Total Amount—Amount to be remitted 1904.
Q. Mr. Brigg; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *May 4*, 376.

Questions

Interpolation of word "Roman" in question relating to Roman Catholics.
Os. Mr. Delany, Mr. Speaker, Mr. J. Redmond, *May 16*, 1391, 1392.

Personal Accusations—Opportunity for Reply, etc.
Os. Mr. McKenna, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Sir F. Flannery, Mr. A. J. Balfour, Mr. Speaker, *May 5*, 546–548.

Printers' Errors in.
O. Mr. McKenna, *May 5*, 545.

Speaker's Rulings as to, *see under* Speaker.

Quilter, Sir W. C. [Suffolk, Sudbury]
Arsenical Poisoning—Adopting Recommendations of Royal Commission—Fixing Standard of Purity for Beer, etc., *May 11*, 1009.

Radcliffe Tramways and Improvement Bill
c. Rep.* *May 13*, 1290.

Railways
Accidents—Returns and Reports Presented, *May 4*, 372; *May 5*, 495.

Railways—*cont.*

Bideford, Westward Ho and Appledore—Loop on Quay Road, Bideford, Refusing to Sanction.
Q. Mr. Soares; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *May 13*, 1295.

Canal and Railway Commission, Report of, Presented, *May 9*, 703, 737.

Fog Signals, Mechanical, Adoption of.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *May 12*, 1155–1156.

Ireland.

Buncrana and Carndonagh—Appointment of Arbitrators.
Q. Mr. O'Doherty; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *Apr. 29*, 15.

Great Northern Trains, Lack of Sanitary Accommodation on.
Q. Mr. Jordan; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *May 16*, 1395.

Rosslare and Fishguard, Negotiations concerning.
Q. Mr. J. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 12*, 1174–1175.

Sligo to Collooney Ticket Grievance.
Q. Mr. O'Dowd; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *May 2*, 124, 125.

Tralee and Dingle, Development Fund Grant for.
Q. Mr. J. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 12*, 1173–1174.

Light Railways—Orders Presented, *May 12*, 1151; *May 13*, 1272.

Pekin Syndicate, of—Negotiations with the Chinese Government.
Q. Mr. Yerburgh; *A.* Earl Percy, *May 12*, 1157.

Rates and Transit Facilities on Agricultural Produce.

Butter, Irish—Rates to English Markets.
Q. Mr. Joyce; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 9*, 765.

Committee of Inquiry.
Ireland, for, Appointment of.
Qs. Mr. MacVeagh, Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 11*, 1027.

Tenant Farmers, Placing on.
Q. Sir E. Strachey; *A.* Mr. A. Fellowes, *May 4*, 761–762.

Milk—Allowing Locked Churns—Circulating Explanatory Leaflet.
Q. Sir E. Strachey; *A.* Mr. A. Fellowes, *May 9*, 762–763.

Scotland, High Charges in—Reply from Railway Companies to Representations of the Board.
Q. Mr. Buchanan; *A.* Mr. A. Fellowes, *May 16*, 1370–1371.

Returns Presented, *May 2*, 76, 89.

Randles, Mr. J. S. [Cumberland, Cockermouth]
- Members of Parliament.
  - Expenses imposed on, by Returning Officers, *May 11*, 1119.
  - Payment of, proposed, *May 11*, 1120.

Rasch, Major Sir F. C. [Essex, Chelmsford]
- Aged Pensioners Bill, 2 R., *May 6*, 682.
- Army.
  - Candidates' Examinations — Leaving and Qualifying Certificates—Preliminary Examination, *May 4*, 377.
  - Guards, Caps of—New Service Cap proposed, *May 2*, 105.
  - Manœuvres—Essex Yeomanry, Employment of—Question of Pay, *May 3*, 244.
  - Officers' Uniforms—New Overcoats for the Foot Guards—Date of last change, *May 9*, 755-756.
- Members of Parliament.
  - Expenses imposed on, by Returning Officers, *May 11*, 1123.
  - Payment of, proposed, *May 11*, 1123.
- Navy Pensions—Granting, to Men of Sixty five, having done Campaign Service and in receipt of Medal, *May 13*, 1293.

Rats
- Plague spread by—Fumigating Vessels from Plague-infected Ports.
  - *Q.* Sir T. Dewar; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *May 3*, 250.

Ray, River
- Insanitary Condition of—Obliging Local Authorities to Cleanse.
  - *Q.* Sir F. Dixon-Hartland; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *May 16*, 1366.

Rea, Mr. R. [Gloucester]
- Civil Service Estimates, Class 5, Total Sum expended under, on South African Colonies 1901-2 and 1902-3. *May 12*, 1158-1159.
- Merchant Shipping (Lighthouses) Bill, 2 R., *May 13*, 1304.

Reay, Lord
- Tibet Expedition, Information as to, *May 9*, 704.

Reddy, Mr. M. [King's County, Birr]
- Tuam—District Nurse O'Connor, Augmenting Salary of, *May 4*, 389.

Redmond, Mr. J. E. [Waterford]
- Arklow Harbour Improvement—Report of Board of Works Engineer, Circulation of, *May 2*, 124.
- Bank of Ireland.
  - Government Moneys passing through —Approximate Daily Balance of Money on which no Interest is allowed, etc., *May 9*, 774.

Redmond, Mr. J. E.—*cont.*
- Bank of Ireland—*cont.*
  - Loan to Government during South African War, Interest Charged—Appointment of Committee of Inquiry, proposed, *May 16*, 1396.
- Bishoprics of Southwark and Birmingham Bill, 2R., *May 4*, 449.
- Business of the House, course of, *May 12*, 1029.
- Constabulary.
  - Interference by, in Public Gatherings, Regulations as to—Cases of Banbridge, Roscommon, etc., *May 11*, 1020, 1021.
  - Recruiting for, *May 9*, 768.
- Crimes Act, Ireland, Repeal of, proposed, *May 4*, 484-88.
- Development Fund, Items of Supplementary Estimate for—Tralee and Dingle Railway — Training Colleges, etc., *May 12*, 1173-1174.
- Dublin College of Science, Architect of—Dissatisfaction at appointment of Englishman, *May 6*, 395.
- Finance Bill—Facilities for Discussion, *May 3*, 366.
- Home Rule for Ireland, Granting, proposed, *May 4*, 485.
- Labourers (Ireland) Bill, Date of Second Reading, *May 12*, 1184.
- Land Act (1903), Amendment Bill—Date of Second Reading, *May 12*, 1184.
- Land Commission—Annual Report, Date of Publishing, *May 3*, 257; *May 9*, 771-772.
- Longford, Abusive Soldier at, taking Action against, *May 4*, 387.
- Questions in the House—Interpolation of word "Roman" in question relating to Roman Catholics, *May 16*, 1391.
- Registration of Clubs (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *May 6*, 655, 661.

Redmond, Mr. W. H. K. [Clare, E.]
- Kilkee, Sanitary Authority for—Appointment of Officers, *May 12*, 1160.
- Kilrush Postmastership — Applications from members of Irish Service, etc., *May 13*, 1294.
- Local Government (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill, 2R., *Apr. 29*, 60.
- Motor Car Services, Date of starting, *May 3*, 254.
- Mount Shannon Estate, Purchase of, to enlarge adjoining Holdings, *May 9*, 747-748.
- Parliament, duration of, *May 3*, 267.
- St. Louis Exhibition, Irish Exhibits at, *May 4*, 388.
- Somaliland, British Garrison for—Strength, &c., *May 2*, 110.

[*cont.*

Redmond, Mr. W. H. K.—*cont.*
South African War Supplies—Food destroyed as unfit for use, Liability of Contractors, &c., *May 2*, 104.
Tarbet and Kilrush Tourist Steamers—Government Subsidy, *May 3*, 254–255.
Tobacco, Stripped—Withdrawal of Duty, proposed, *May 2*, 112.
Transvaal, Importation of Chinese Labour to—ascertaining Transvaal opinion by Vote, *May 3*, 265.

Regent's Canal and Dock Company
Rates and charges of.
Report by Board of Trade presented, *May 12*, 1151 ; *May 13*, 1273.

Registrars
County Courts, Ireland—Fees and Salaries, Return Ordered, *May 12*, 1005.

Registration of Clubs (Ireland) Bill
c. 2R., *May 6*, 648.
Debate on Second Reading [Commons] *May 6*, 648.
Bogus Clubs, Extermination of, aimed at, 648, 651, 657–659, 666.
Certificate, terms and form of, 649, 652.
"Club," Absence of definition of, 656.
Court of Summary Jurisdiction, Powers to be given to, 651–654, 656, 661, 662, 665.
Government assistance to pass Bill into Law during present Session, proposed, 666.
Inspection of Clubs, Provisions as to, 650.
Licensing Act, Effect of, on working men's clubs, 649, 664.
Officials of Clubs, Severity of penalties on, 657, 658, 664, 668.
Registrar, duties of, 649.
Registration fee, 649.
Rules of Clubs to be submitted to Registrar, 650.
Sale of intoxicating liquors off the premises, Provisions as to, 653, 654, 665–668.
Scottish Act, successful working of, 659, 661, 662.
Scottish system, Impossibility of adapting to Ireland, 651–654.
Temperance, Furtherance of, aimed at, 648, 650, 651.
Universal approval of the measure, 648, 655, 658.

Reid, Sir R. T. [Dumfries Burghs]
Licensing Bill, 2R., *May 10*, 938.

Renshaw, Sir C. B. [Renfrew, W.]
Education [Scotland] Bill, 2R., *May 2*, 166.

Renwick, Mr. G. [Newcastle-on-Tyne]
Finance Bill, 2R., *May 16*, 1489.
Financial Policy of the Government—Increase in Expenditure and Taxation, etc., *May 16*, 1489.
Merchant Shipping (Lighthouses) Bill, 2R., *May 13*, 1332.

Re-vaccination Bill
c. Bill withdrawn, *May 6*, 700.
l. 1R.* *May 16*, 1359.

Revenue and Expenditure
Capital Expenditure and Borrowings, increase in, and objections to, References to, in debate on the Finance Bill, *May 16*, 1435, 1476.
Customs and Excise Duties ; Revenue derived from, 1899-1900 — Estimated Amounts, 1904–5, etc.
Q. Mr. H. Samuel ; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *May 5*, 526–527.
Exchequer Balances, State of, and drafts on.
O. Mr. McCrae, *May 16*, 1437.
References to, in debate on the Finance Bill, *May 16*, 1437.
Financial position of the Country, References to, in debate on the Finance Bill, *May 16*, 1400, 1438, 1481, 1482, 1485, 1486.
Growth of Expenditure—References to, in debate on the Finance Bill, *May 16*, 1400, 1402, 1404, 1410, 1424, 1427, 1434, 1441–1443, 1450, 1481, 1483, 1491.
Aggressive attitude of Great Britain towards other Nations, the cause of.
Os. Mr. T. Taylor, *May 16*, 1492, 1493.
Rate of, in recent times, References to in debate on the Finance Bill, 1442, 1447, 1464, 1493, 1494.
Responsibility of the Government for, References to, in debate on the Finance Bill, *May 16*, 1413, 1415, 1420, 1421, 1423, 1426, 1427, 1432, 1434, 1440, 1452, 1453, 1464, 1465, 1473, 1474, 1482, 1484, 1490.
Statistics of, since 1895, References to, in debate on the Finance Bill, *May 16*, 1403, 1412, 1434, 1443, 1481.
Review of, as a whole, proposed.
O. Mr. H. Fisher, *May 16*, 1429, 1430.
Specific items in which reduction could be made, Impossibility of indicating—References to, in debate on the Finance Bill, *May 16*, 1402, 1418, 1450, 1451.
Treasury Control over spending Departments.
O. Mr. Buchanan, *May 16*, 1477.

Richard Jaeger's Patent Bill
l. 2R.* *May 2*, 74.

Richards, Mr. H. C. [Finsbury, E.]
Finance Bill, 2R., *May 16*, 1460.
Financial Policy of the Government—Increase in Expenditure and Taxation, &c., *May 16*, 1460-1463.
Fire, Precautions against, in Institutions under Government Control, *May 4*, 373-374.
Post Office.
  Australia, negotiations as to penny post with, *May 12*, 1231.
  Canada, Rates charged on newspapers posted to, *May 12*, 1231.
  Egypt, extension of Penny Post to, proposed, *May 12*, 1232.
  Halfpenny Post.
    Extending to letters, proposed, *May 12*, 1233.
    Letters examined and delayed by Officials, etc., *May 12*, 1230, 1231.
  Letter boxes on through trains, provision of, *May 12*, 1231.
  Post Cards, communications on face of—extension of regulations as to, to all post cards, proposed, *May 12*, 1231.
  Rural and local Offices, extra work imposed on Employés during times of pressure, *May 12*, 1232.

Ridley, Mr. S. F. [Bethnal Green, S.W.]
Ministerial Office, Necessity for Re-election on Acceptance of, Introducing Bill to remove, *May 3*, 266-267.

Ridley, Mr. M. W. [Stalybridge]
Somaliland Campaign—Capture of Illig—Co-operation of Italian Squadron, *May 9*, 759.

Riot Act
Ireland, application to.
  Os. Mr. H. Burke, *May 4*, 465; Mr. W. Moore, 467.

Ritchie, Right Hon. C. T. [Croydon]
Merchant Shipping (Lighthouses) Bill, 2R., *May 13*, 1330.

Ritualistic Practices
"Children's Eucharist," illegality of.
  Os. Mr. C. McArthur, *May 4*, 404, 405; Mr. B. Jones, 411.
Growth of—Specific instances, etc.
  Os. Mr. C. McArthur, *May 4*, 404; Mr. B. Jones, 408, 409; Mr. J. Chamberlain, 412.
Oxford Movement the origin of, alleged.
  O. Mr. B. Jones, *May 4*, 409, 410.
"Protestant"—meaning of word.
  O. Mr. B. Jones, *May 4*, 410.
Royal Commission on—Terms of Reference.
  Q. Mr. B. Jones; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *May 3*, 265-266.

Roads
Scotland.
  Carloway to Stornoway, date of completion.
    O. Mr. Weir, *May 5*, 585.
  Gravir to Cromore, Cost of—Inefficiency of Government Survey.
    O. Mr. Weir, *May 5*, 562.
  Orkney, Delay in Construction in.
    Os. Mr. C. Wason, *May 5*, 553; Mr. A. G. Murray, 588.

Roberts, Mr. J. H. [Denbighshire, W.]
India—Police Service, Committee Recommendations—Estimated Cost of Adoption, *May 16*, 1372.
Licensing Bill, 2R., *May 11*, 1094.
  Value of Licensed Premises, Ascertaining, *May 2*, 114, 115.

Robertson, Mr. E. [Dundee]
Finance Bill, 2R., *May 16*, 1456.
Financial Policy of the Government—Increase in Expenditure and Taxation, etc., *May 16*, 1456-1460.
Liquor Licences.
  Monopoly Value of, *May 16*, 1459, 1460.
  Proportion of, to Population (England and Wales), *May 4*, 384.
Navy—Chilian Warships, Purchase of—Date of Contract—Tabling Correspondance, etc., *May 5*, 536.

Robson, Mr. W. S. [South Shields]
Tobacco, Increased Duties on—Budget proposals, *May 3*, 275-283.

Roche, Mr. J. [Galway, E.]
Ballinasloe Lunatic Asylum — Appointment of Dr. Kirwan, Delay in Sanctioning, *May 5*, 531; *May 16*, 1386.
Constabulary—Temperance Society joined by Constable Scully—Resignation of Members — Directing him to Withdraw, *May 11*, 1021-1022.
Education—Mount Bellew—School built by Private Effort—Sanctioning Expenditure for Technical Instruction, *May 12*, 1177.
Gun Licences—Martin Jennings, Reason for Depriving of Gun, etc., *May 11*, 1021.
Killanin, Lord, Property of—Purchase by Tenants—Acquiring Grazing Farm to enlarge Holdings, *May 9*, 764-765.
Turf Thefts from Kellysgrove Bog—Advising Remission of Excessive Sentence Imposed at Ballinasloe Petty Sessions, *May 12*, 1177.

Rockfield Estate, Co. Kerry
Sale of—Forcing Terms on Tenants, etc.
  Q. Mr. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Wyndham *May 5*, 543.

Roe, Sir T. [Derby]
Churchill, Private J., wrongful Arrest of —Question of Compensation, *Apr. 29*, 13.

Rolleston, Sir J. F. L. [Leicester]
Milwr and District Mines Drainage Bill, 2R., *May 9*, 841.

Rollit, Sir A. K. [Islington, South]
Merchant Shipping (Lighthouses) Bill, 2R., *May 13*, 1307.
Post Office—Wages of Officials, Report of Committee of Inquiry into—Presenting to the House and allowing facilities for discussion of, *May 12*, 1218.

Ropner, Col. Sir E. H. O. Robert [Stockton]
Merchant Shipping (Lighthouses) Bill, 2R., *May 13*, 1321.

Roscommon
Quarter Sessions—Notifying Jurors in the Absence of Criminal Business.
Q. Mr. Hayden; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 3*, 252.

Rose, Mr. C. D. [Cambridge, Newmarket
Crown Agents, purchases by, for the Transvaal — Class of requirements supplied, *May 2*, 105.
Education—Religious Instruction, Punishment of Children for Parents' Refusal to conform to Regulations regarding, *May 11*, 1005.

Rossbeg
Landing Accommodation for Fishing Boats, providing additional.
Q. Mr. H. Law; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 3*, 254.

Rosslare
Railway to Fishguard, Negotiations concerning.
Q. Mr. J. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 12*, 1174–1175.

Rowe Estate
Sale of—Delay in procedure in Land Judge's Court.
Q. Mr. Ffrench; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 2*, 122.
Cause of Delay.
Qs. Mr. Ffrench, Mr. T. W. Russell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 4*, 391.

Royal Irish Constabulary
see Constabulary, Royal Irish.

Royal Naval Reserve
see under Navy.

Runciman, Mr. W. [Dewsbury]
Defence of the Empire—Expenditure under Act for military purposes from 1888–1896, *May 13*, 1296.
Navy—France, Germany, and Russia, Expenditure of, apart from War Expenditure in each of the past twenty-five years, *May 13*, 1295–1296.

Russell, Mr. T. W. [Tyrone, S.]
Bands playing in Public, Police interference with—Cases of Meetings disturbed, *May 11*, 1020.
Bishoprics of Southwark and Birmingham Bill, 2R., *May 4*, 445.
Crimes Act, Ireland, Administration of, *May 4*, 488.
Land Commission—Annual Report—Including Report from Estates Commissioners, *May 9*, 772.
Land Purchase.
Encumbered Estates, Procedure for inspection of, etc. under Act, *May 2*, 120.
Rowe Estate, Wexford—Delay as to Sale, *May 4*, 391.
Trinity College, Dublin—Powers of Land Commission in fixing Purchase Price of Head Rents, etc., *May 12*, 1181, *May 16*, 1394.
Licensing Bill, 2R., *May 11*, 1044, 1092.
Local Government (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill, 2R., *Apr. 29*, 29.
Moy, Co. Tyrone, Morning Mail Service from, restoring, *May 5*, 520.
Powerscourt Estate—Fair Rent Appeals—Date of Completing Cases, *May 12*, 1152.

Russia
Navy, Expenditure on, apart from War Expenditure, in each of the past twenty-five years.
Q. Mr. Runciman; *A.* Mr. Pretyman, *May 13*, 1295–1296.
Tibet Expedition, Communications regarding, since Nov. 17, 1903—Tabling Papers.
Q. Mr. Bryce; *A.* Earl Percy, *May 11*, 1015.
War with Japan, *see* Russo-Japanese War.

Russo-Japanese War
Newchwang, British Life and Property at, steps to safeguard, etc.
Qs. Mr. C. McArthur, Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Earl Percy, *May 11*, 1015–1016.
Newspapers, arrangements as to transport of, by the Siberian Railway.
Qs. Mr. L. Sinclair, *May 12*, 1224; Lord Stanley, 1256.

Rutherford, Mr. W. W. [Liverpool, West Derby]
Post Office.
Comparison of present day organisation, facilities, and charges, with those 230 years ago, *May 12*, 1251, 1252.
Officials—Committee of Inquiry, Report of—Subjects dealt with, in, *May 12*, 1220.
Profits made by, applying, to bettering Conditions of Service, etc., *May 12*, 1252, 1253.

Ryde Gas Bill
l. Rep.* *May 5*, 493.
3 R.* *May 10*, 866.

St. Andrew's
University of—Annual Statistical, etc., Report presented, *May 9*, 703, 704, 738.

St. Asaph, Lord Bishop of
Education [Transferred Schools] Bill, 1R., *May 9*, 704.

St. Bartholomew's Hospital Bill
l. 3R * *May 6*, 633.
c. 1R.* *May 6*, 641.

St. David's, Lord Bishop of
Education [Transferred Schools] Bill, 1R., *May 9*, 711.

St. James' Park
Paths.
Removal of Pathway at west end of ornamental water.
Q. Sir J. Leng; *A.* Lord Balcarres, *May 10*, 887.
Repair of.
Q. Capt. Norton; *A.* Lord Balcarres, *May 16*, 1384.

St. Louis Exhibition
Irish Exhibits at.
Q. Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 4*, 388-389.

St. Marylebone Electric Lighting Bill
l. Report from Select Committee. *May 16*, 1357.

St. Mary Woolnoth Bill
l. Report from Select Committee. *May 3*, 221.
Rep.* *May 10*, 865.
3R.* *May 16*, 1358.

St. Patrick's Training College
Delay in awarding Teaching Diplomas.
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 12*, 1161.

St. Winifred's Well
Effect of the Milwr and District Mines Drainage Scheme upon.
Os. In Debates on the Milwr and District Mines Drainage Bill, *May 9*, 833, 835, 837-842; *May 12*, 1241-1244.

Sale of Butter Bill
Proceeding with—Date of Second Reading.
Q. Mr. O'Shaughnessy; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *May 4*, 396.

Sale of Intoxicants to Children Bill
l. Rep.* *May 2*, 76.
3R.* *May 5*, 496.

Salisbury, Late Marquess of
Manuscripts of, Royal Commission Report, presented, *Apr. 29*, 4, 12.
Statue, Proposed erection of.
Motion (Mr. Brodrick), Date of taking.
Q. Mr. J. Ellis; *A.* Mr. Speaker, *May 16*, 1399.
O. Marquess of Lansdowne, *May 13*, 1289.
Q. Sir M. H. Beach; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *May 2*, 126.

Samuel, Mr. H. L. [Yorkshire, Cleveland]
Aliens, numbers of, in receipt of Poor Law Relief other than Medical, *May 4*, 385.
Crown Agents for the Colonies—Articles tendered for during last three years, &c., *May 16*, 1375.
Customs and Excise Duties, Revenue derived from 1899-1900 — Estimated Amounts 1904-5, etc., *May 5*, 526.
Transvaal Labour Question — Natives in Mines.
Doctors, Tabling Report of, proposed, *May 16*, 1378.
Mortality among—Total Number of Native Deaths on the Rand 1903, *May 11*, 1014.
Treatment of, *May 5*, 622-624.
Unclaimed dividends on Government Stock, appropriating, to pay off Budget deficit, *May 3*, 363.

Samuel, Sir H. S. [Tower Hamlets, Limehouse]
Workhouses, Nursing Sick poor in—Issuing general Order consequent on Committee's recommendations, *May 16*, 1366.

Sandys, Col. T. M. [Lancashire, Bootle]
Bishoprics of Southwark and Birmingham Bill, 2R., *May 4*, 428.

Saunderson, Col. Rt. Hon. E. J. [Armagh, N.]
Crimes (Ireland) Act, Administration of, *May 4*, 472-74.
Local Government (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill, 2R., *Apr. 29*, 55, 59.

Savings Banks Acts (Amendment) Bill
c. Rep.* *May 3*, 270.

Scarisbrick Estate (Amendment) Bill
l. 1R.* *May 2*, 73.

Schwann, Mr. C. E. [Manchester, N.]
India — Seistan Boundary Commission—Estimated Cost of Work—Defraying Cost, etc., *May 3*, 246-247.
Volunteers — Manchester 2nd Battalion, Camp of—Offering suitable Training Ground, *May 3*, 244-245.

"Scotia"

Salvage Services rendered to—Recovery of Claims against Vessels owned by the Crown.
Os. Lord Muskerry, *Apr. 29*, 5; Duke of Marlborough, 7.

Scotland

Secretary—Mr. A. Graham Murray.
Lord Advocate—Mr. C Scott Dickson.
Lord Justice-General—Lord Kinross.
Vice-President of the Council of Education—Mr. A. Graham Murray.

Acreage of Wheat, Barley and Total Corn, 1849–53 and 1899–1903.
Q. Mr. J. A. Pease; *A.* Mr. A. Fellowes, *May 9*, 742.

Allotments—County and Parish Councils, proceedings of.
Return presented, *May 16*, 1363.

Army Chaplains — Allowing the Free Church a share of Appointments.
Q. Capt. Ellice; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *May 2*, 103.

Avoch, Ross-shire—Government Grant for Harbour.
Qs. Mr. Weir; *As.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *May 5*, 525; *May 16*, 1364.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *May 10*, 894.

Barvas—Destitution consequent on Failure of Crops—Relief Works, proposed.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *May 2*, 119.

Carloway and Stornoway, Road between—Date of completion.
O. Mr. Weir, *May 5*, 585.

Census of 1901—Figures relating to Occupations of People.
Q. Mr. Toulmin; *A.* Mr. G. Balfour, *May 11*, 1009.

Congested Districts Board, *see that title.*

Cromore to Gravir, Road Construction, Cost of—Inefficiency of Government Survey.
O. Mr. Weir, *May 5*, 562.

Crosbost, Burying Ground of—Acquisition of New Ground.
Q Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *May 2*, 118, 119.

Deer Forests, *see that title.*

Dundee, *see that title.*

Education, *see that title.*

Erbusaig School, Unsatisfactory Water Supply—Steps to Remedy.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *May 16*, 1364.

Fisheries, *see that title.*

Fraserburgh, Naval Reserve Battery at, Establishment of.
Q. Mr. Maconochie; *A.* Mr. A. Lee, *May 2*, 102–103.

Highlands and Islands, *see that title.*

Scotland—*cont.*

Inverness Prison, Constitution of Visiting Committee.
Rule presented, *May 11*, 1004; *May 13*, 1272.

Law Courts, lack of accommodation in, delay in carrying out enlargements.
O. Mr. Ure, *May 5*, 565.

Lewis, Island of, *see that title.*

Licensed Premises, Valuation of, for Estate Duty—Method, etc.
Q. Mr. Black; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *May 9*, 759–760.

Liquor Licences—Number withdrawn for Causes other than Misconduct since 1880.
Q. Mr. M. Ferguson; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *May 9*, 745.

Lochcarron Water Supply, Remedying defects, proposed.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *May 2*, 118.

Lunacy Commission, Constitution and Duties of.
Os. Sir J. Tuke, *May 12*, 1188, 1189; Sir R. Finlay, 1209.

Motor Cars—Speed Regulations, Enforcement in record-breaking tours.
Q. Mr. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *May 2*, 119.

Orkney, *see that title.*

Peat industry, development of, proposed.
Os. Mr. Maconochie, *May 5*, 581; Mr. Weir, 582.

Post Office, *see that title.*

Railway Rates on Agricultural Produce—Reply from Railway Companies to Representations of Agricultural Board.
Q. Mr. Buchanan; *A.* Mr. A. Fellowes, *May 16*, 1370–1371.

Roads, *see that title.*

St Andrew's—Annual Statistical Report presented, *May 9*, 703, 704, 738.

Secretary's Office.
Consulting Engineer, inefficiency of work, alleged.
O. Mr. Weir, *May 5*, 561, 562.
Ultimus Hæres—Receipts and payments and list of Estates administered (1903).
Return ordered, *May 9*, 739; presented *May 12*, 1150.

Scott-Montagu, Mr. G. [Hampshire, New Forest]

Crown Agents for the Colonies—Salaries, Commissions, etc., *May 13*, 1298; *May 16*, 1375.

Sea Fisheries Bill

l. 3R., *May 2*, 85.

Seamen

Percentage of British, Foreign, and Lascar, etc., employed.
Os. Lord Wolverton, *May 9*, 723; Lord Brassey, 732, 733.

Secondary and Technical Education
See under Education.

Secretary of State for the Colonies
Mr. Alfred Lyttelton.

Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs
Marquess of Lansdowne.

Secretary of State for India
Mr. W. St. John Brodrick.

Secretary for Scotland
Mr. A. Graham Murray.

Secretary of State for War
Mr. H. O. Arnold-Forster.

Seely, Maj. J. E. B. [Isle of Wight.]
Africa, South—date of Census Return, *May 2,* 107.
Bishoprics of Southwark and Birmingham Bill, 2R., *May 4,* 429.
Transvaal.
  Chinese Labour, Importation of—Transvaal Opinion on.
    Ascertaining, by vote, *May 5,* 549.
    Chamberlain, Mr. J., Adhering to Pledge by, to consider, *May 3,* 263-264.
  Mortality in Mines.
    Tabling Reports, *May 11,* 1012-1013.
    Total Number of Native Deaths, 1903, *May 11,* 1013.
  Native Labour in Mines.
    Cape of Good Hope Blue Book G. 4, 1904, Date of Tabling, *May 11,* 1012.
    Treatment of Natives—Proposed Government Action, *May 5,* 549, 592-595, 628.
  White Labour in Mines, proportion of, before and since the War, *May 2,* 107.

Seistan Boundary Commission.
Estimated Cost of Work—Defraying Cost, etc.
  Q. Mr. Schwann ; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *May 3,* 246-247.

Selborne, Earl of—*First Lord of the Admiralty.*
Royal Naval Reserve.
  Age limit, Extension of, proposed, *May 6,* 636.
  Commander, Qualifications for rank of, *May 6,* 635.

Shackleton, Mr. D. J. [Lancashire, Clitheroe]
Army Clothing Factory, Engineers' Department—Regulations as to Sick Pay and Compensation for Accidents, *May 11,* 1011.
Trades Union and Trades Disputes Bill, Facilitating Passage of, *May 5,* 548-549.

Shaw, Mr. T. [Hawick Burghs]
Education [Scotland] Bill, 2R., *May 2,* 142.
Local Government [Ireland] Acts Amendment Bill, 2R., *Apr. 29,* 52.
Registration of Clubs [Ireland] Bill, 2R., *May 6,* 658.

Sheehan, Mr. D. D. [Cork Co., Mid.]
Cork Prison Infirmary—Death of M. Curtin in, *May 11,* 1025.
Education — Evening Schools — Grants, Regulations as to, *May 10,* 897.
Labourers Acts, Ireland.
  Farmers, Small, Housing of—Making Provision in Labourers (Ireland) Bill, *May 11,* 1017.
  Fishermen, Inclusion of, proposed, *May 10,* 894, 895.
Local Government Board, Ireland—Annual Report, Date of Tabling, etc., *May 12,* 1179, 1180.

Sheehy, Mr. D. [Meath, S.]
Land Purchase—Future Tenants, Purchase of Holdings by — Remedy against Exorbitant Demands, *May 9,* 763.
Local Government (Ireland) Act—Order, Date of issue of, *May 2,* 120.

Shipley Urban District Council Bill
l. 3R.* *Apr. 29,* 2.
c. 1R.* *May 2,* 88.
  2R.* *May 16,* 1361.

Shipman, Dr. J. G. [Northampton]
Animals, Experiments on—Date of publishing Returns for 1903, etc., *May 4,* 375.
County Courts—Extension of Jurisdiction, Introducing Bill, *May 9,* 739.
Metropolitan Asylums Board—Application to register a place for Vivisection, *May 5,* 523.

Shoddy Factories
Inspection, Machinery, etc., of.
  Return ordered, *May 2,* 90.

Siam
French convention with—*Status* of Protected Subjects—Ratification of the Convention—Agreements recognised by Anglo-French Agreement.
  Q. Sir C. Dilke ; *A.* Earl Percy, *May 12,* 1169.

Sinclair, Mr. L. [Essex, Romford]
- Post Office.
  - Motor Services of, extension of, *May 12*, 1224.
  - Newspapers, arrangements as to transport of, by the Siberian Railway during the war, *May 12*, 1224.
  - Telegrams to France, cost of, *May 12*, 1224.

Skewes-Cox, Mr. T. [Surrey, Kingston]
- Kew Gardens, Lot's Eyot, facing Entrance to, proposed Barge Dock on—Making Protests, *May 12*, 1156.
- Navy — Paymasters-in-Chief — Commuted Allowance, Reason for Refusing Payment of, *May 4*, 380–381.

Slack, Mr. B. [Hertfordshire, St. Albans]
- Post Office rates for Magazines, etc.
  - Canada, rates charged to, *May 12*, 1266.
  - Reduction of, proposed, *May 12*, 1266.

Sloan, Mr. T. H. [Belfast, S.]
- Ballinasloe Asylum—Appointment of Dr. Kirwan.
  - Confirmation of, *May 9*, 772–773.
  - Senior Assistant, Reason for passing over, *May 16*, 1387.
- Banbridge Disturbances.
  - Action of Rioters, *May 11*, 1020.
  - Prosecutions of Rioters, etc., *May 16*, 1392.
- Clones Telegraph Service Competition — Appointment of unsuccessful candidate to post, *May 16*, 1396.
- Constabulary — Public House Property, Constables having an Interest in—Stationing in another County, *May 9*, 772.
- Granard Workhouse—Dismissal of Master, Reasons, etc., *May 16*, 1385.
- Landlords of Small Holdings—Liability for Rates—Proposed Amendment of Local Government Act, *May 12*, 1161.
- Local Government (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill, 2R., *Apr. 29*, 31, 42.
- Railway Fog Signals—Adopting Electrical Apparatus, *May 12*, 1155.
- Registration of Clubs (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *May 6*, 668.

Smallpox
- East London, Outbreak in — Cause — Number of Patients removed by Metropolitan Asylums Board.
  - *Q.* Sir T. Dewar; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *May 3*, 249–250.
- Experiments.
  - Joyce Green Hospital, Inoculation of dogs at.
    - *Q.* Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *May 10*, 893.
  - Registration of place for.
    - *Q.* Dr. Shipman; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *May 5*, 523.

Smith, Mr. J. P. [Lanarkshire, Partick]
- Education [Scotland] Bill, 2R., *May 2*, 153.
- Tobacco, increased duties on—Budget proposals, *May 3*, 283.

Smoke Nuisance
- Foreign Legislation regarding, Tabling Reports as to.
  - *Q.* Mr. Bryce; *A.* Earl Percy, *May 16*, 1380–1381.

Soares, Mr. E. [Devonshire, Barnstaple]
- Bideford, Westward Ho and Appledore Railway—Loop on Quay Road, Bideford, refusing to Sanction, *May 13*, 1295.
- Devonshire and Cornwall, utility of Harbours of Refuge in—Capt. Frederick's Report, *May 5*, 521.
- Ley's Charity—Representation of Parish of Combe Martin, *May 5*, 521–522.

Solicitor-General
- *Sir E. Carson.*

Solicitor-General for Ireland
- *Mr. J. H. M. Campbell.*

Solicitor-General
- Fees and Salaries of English and Irish.
  - *Q.* Mr. Whitley; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *May 5*, 522.

Solicitors Bill
- c. 1R.* *May 16*, 1400.

Somaliland
- British Garrison for—Strength, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Earl Percy, *May 2*, 110.
- Campaign.
  - Cost, Total, including Estimate for 1904.
    - *Q.* Mr. Lambert; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *May 12*, 1162.
    - Total cost prior to 1st Oct. 1902.
      - *Q.* Mr. Lambert; *A.* Earl Percy, *May 13*, 1296.
  - Expenditure on, and reasons for undertaking, References to, in debate on the Finance Bill, *May 16*, 1425, 1439, 1440, 1484.
  - Illig, Capture of.
    - Continuance of operations, etc.
      - *Q.* Mr. C. Hobhouse; *A.* Earl Percy, *May 2*, 110.
    - Italian Squadron, Co-operation of.
      - *Q.* Mr. W. Ridley; *A.* Earl Percy, *May 9*, 759.
  - Mijertain Tribe.
    - Mullah attacked by,
      - *Qs.* Mr. Lambert; *As.* Earl Percy, *May 2*, 109, 110.
    - Strength of—Strength of Mullah's Forces.
      - *Q.* Mr. Lambert; *A.* Earl Percy, *May 4*, 383.

[*cont.*

Somaliland—*cont.*
Campaign—*cont.*
Mullah, Position of—Rifles and Ammunition captured—Supply of Arms remaining to Mullah.
Q. Mr. Lambert; *A.* Earl Percy, *May 12*, 1169–1170.

South African War
Medals — Natal Volunteer Ambulance Corps, Granting Queen's Medals to.
Q. Sir M. Bhownaggree; *A.* Mr. B. Davenport, *May 9*, 753.
Supplies—Food destroyed as unfit for use—Value, liability of contractors, etc.
Q. Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *May 2*, 104.
Taxation levied on account of—Continuation of, after cessation of the War, etc.—References to, in debate on the Finance Bill, *May 16*, 1405, 1406, 1413, 1426, 1433, 1428, 1442, 1443, 1474, 1481.
Volunteers and Yeomanry on Active Service during War.
Q. Mr. S. Ormsby-Gore; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *May 2*, 105.

Southport
Post Office—Appointment of Postmaster's Son—Rule as to Relatives in the same Office.
Q. Mr. Goddard; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 12*, 1154.

Southport and Lytham Tramroad (Extension of Time) Bill
c. 2 R.* *May 2*, 86.

South Staffordshire Mines Drainage Bill
l. 3 R.* *May 2*, 74.
c. 1 R * *May 3*, 237.
2 R.* *May 16*, 1361.

Southwark
Bishopric of, *see* Bishoprics of Birmingham and Southwark Bill.

Spain
Trade Reports presented, *May 5*, 494.

Speaker
Adjournment of the House, Refusal to put Motion for, as being an Abuse of the Rules, *May 3*, 367.
Budget Resolutions—Proposals as to New Taxes not in order on Report stage, *May 3*, 333, 334.
Improper Observations Addressed to the Chair, *May 4*, 469.
Indisposition of, and Appointment of Mr. J. W. Lowther as Deputy-Speaker, *May 10*, 879; *May 11*, 1001; *May 12*, 1145.
Irrelevant Matter, Introduction of, *Apr. 29*, 60; *May 3*, 285, 346; *May 4*, 419, 451, 469; *May 5*, 606, 628; *May 13*, 1314, 1320, 1328; *May 16*, 1459, 1463, 1466, 1486, 1487.

Speaker—*cont.*
Irrelevant Observations, *May 3*, 347; *May 16*, 1379, 1385.
Motion, "That the Question be now put—" Refusal to put Question, *May 11*, 1094.
Personal Allusions and Insinuations, *May 5*, 546-548.
Privilege, Breach of—Church of England Temperance Society, Circular of—Introduction of the King's name, *May 9*, 777.
Questions.
Notice of Supplementary, *May 3*, 265.
"Roman," Interpolation of, in Question Relating to Roman Catholics, *May 16*, 1391.
Statement Having Reference to a Previous Debate, Rule as to, *May 5*, 546, 547.
Words Deleted from, *May 5*, 541.
Salisbury, Late Marquess of, Proposed Erection of Statue of—Date of Taking Motion, *May 16*, 1399.
Standing Orders — "Special Standing Order for the Session," 1904, with Reference to the Port of London Bill, Character and Duration of, *May 9*, 778.
Tibet Expedition—Advance to Lhasa—Mr. Flynn's Motion for Adjournment, *May 12*, 1186–1187.

Spear, Mr. J. W. [Devon, Tavistock]
Licensing Bill, 2R, *May 9*, 845.

Spencer, Earl
Education (Transferred Schools) Bill, 1R., *May 9*, 710.
Light Load Line—Failure of Board of Trade to carry out recommendations of Select Committee, *May 2*, 82.
Macedonian Crisis—Progress made in reforms, etc., *May 5*, 499.
Outdoor Relief (Friendly Societies) Bill—Breach of Privilege in originating in House of Lords, *May 5*, 498.
Whitsuntide Recess, Adjournment for, *May 6*, 637.

Spirits
Excise duties on, Continuance of—Resolution, *May 3*, 323.
Os. Mr. Flynn, *May 3*, 341; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 348–50.

Stamps
see under Post Office.

Standing Orders in the House
Order in the House—Date of Resuming adjourned Discussion of, February 13, 1903.
Q. Mr. Bathurst; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *May 3*, 267–268.

[*cont.*

Standing Orders in the House—*cont.*

Private Members' Bills, Amending Order relating to.

Q. Mr. Trevelyan; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *May 3*, 265.

Sittings of the House, Amending Orders relating to.

Q. Mr. Fitzroy; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *May 3*, 269-270.

"Special Standing Order for the Session 1904," with reference to the Port of London Bill, Character and duration of.

Os. Mr. G. Bowles, Mr. Speaker, *May 9*, 777, 778.

Stanhope, Earl

Rifles, New Service, Cost of, etc., *May 13*, 1281.

Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord—*Postmaster-General* [Lancashire, West Houghton]

Brighton and London, Arranging for more efficient telephone service between, *May 16*, 1368.

Cash-on-Delivery System, Date of Introduction of, *May 3*, 241; *May 4*, 373.

Copyists, Promotion of, to Assistant Clerkships—Compulsory Retirement of Senior Assistant Clerk, *May 2*, 91.

District Messenger Service—Telephone attachment to dial, Sanctioning use of, proposed, *May 12*, 1267.

Dual workers, System of, *May 12*, 1254.

Female Employées.

Learners, Appointment of, on the establishment, *May 2*, 92.

Supervisors in Dublin Office, Discontinuance of, Suggested, *May 3*, 259.

Ireland.

Baltimore Service—Affording Second Delivery, *May 3*, 263.

Belturbet Office—New Building, local objection to—Reconsidering Plans *May 3*, 262.

Castletown, Berehaven, Granting improved Facilities to, *May 5*, 520.

Cork Post Office, Clerk at—Qualifications of Officer selected, &c., *May 16*, 1369.

Cummeen, Increased Postal Facilities to, Proposed, *May 16*, 1367.

Dublin Office, Female Supervisors in, Discontinuance of, Suggested, *May 3*, 259.

Ferns Postmaster—Appointment of Liverpool Town Postmaster—Qualifications for Post, etc, *May 12*, 1153-1154.

Irish Language, Requiring knowledge of, by Officials, *May 3*, 260-261.

Kilrush Postmastership—Applications from Members of Irish Service, etc., *May 13*, 1294.

Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord—*cont.*

Ireland—*cont.*

Knocknagoshel, Co. Kerry, Sunday Delivery at, *May 9*, 774-775.

Leamyglissane, Daily postal delivery at, Proposed, *May 16*, 1367.

Londonderry Office.

Alterations, Date of commencing Proposed, etc., *May 11*, 1008.

Learners, qualified, without Appointments—Providing Situations for, etc., *May 11*, 1007-1008.

Longford—Night Work, Arrangements as to, *May 3*, 263.

Magillan Camp, Opening Telegraph Office at. *May 11*, 1006-1007.

Moy, Co. Tyrone, Morning Mail Service from, Restoring, *May 5*, 520.

Northern District — Superintending Engineer's Staff — Rules as to Residence, *May 3*, 261.

Telephone Service.

Londonderry and Limavady Extension, Cause of Delay in commencing Works, *Apr. 29*, 15.

Tralee, Extending trunk system to, *May 16*, 1367.

Templetown Arrangements—Providing increased Facilities, *May 3*, 261-262.

Tralee, Extending Telephone Trunk System to, *May 16*, 1367.

Valentia Harbour, Continuing Telegraph Office at, during the Fishery Season, *May 12*, 1183.

Learners.

Female, Appointment of, on the Establishment, *May 2*, 92.

Londonderry Office, Qualified Learners in, without Appointments—Providing Situations for, etc., *May 11*, 1007-1008.

Remuneration and Promotion of, *May 12*, 1254.

Letters.

Morning Delivery, Delays, etc., *May 12*, 1233.

Recall of Letters Posted by Mistake, Relaxing Rules as to, proposed, *May 12*, 1256.

London Offices—Insanitary Condition of Smithfield Market and Great Tower Street Branch Offices—Obtaining Report, *May 12*, 1170-1171.

London and Brighton, Arranging for more Efficient Telephone Service between, *May 16*, 1368.

[*cont.*

Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord—*cont.*
- London and Paris, Service between—Late Letter posting—Granting London same Facilities as Paris, *May 6*, 645.
- Lottery Circulars, Suppression of, by Postal Authorities, proposed, *May 12*, 1255, 1260.
- Mail Service.
  - American Mail Landed at Queenstown, Sorting of, etc., *May 3*, 259–260.
  - Eastern—Tabling Committee Report, *May 12*, 1268 ; *May 16*, 1381.
  - Orkney—Delays in Transit, Reasons for, *May 10*, 892, 893.
  - Search of British Steamers by Belligerents, Postal Letters as Contraband of War, etc., *May 10*, 893.
- Money found on Counters, Disposal of, *Apr. 29*, 14.
- Money Orders, Extension of Limit of, to £40, *May 12*, 1222.
- Motor Car Services, Extension of, *May 12*, 1221.
- Newspapers—Siberian Railways, Conveyance by, Arrangements as to, *May 12*, 1256.
- Parcel Post—Foreign Countries, Rates to and from.
  - Anomalies of, alleged, *May 12*, 1267.
  - Lowering, to compete with other European Countries, proposed, *May 11*, 1007.
- Pensions.
  - Scully, Mr., Grievance of, *May 12*, 1255.
  - Woods, Mr., Grievance of, *May 12*, 1255.
- Postage.
  - Halfpenny, Extension of, to Commercial Matter, *May 12*, 1221.
  - Penny.
    - Australia — Negotiations as to, *May 12*, 1223.
    - Universal, Proposals as to Establishment of, *May 12*, 1258.
- Postal Orders.
  - Fines on, Hardships of, *May 12*, 1256.
  - Interchanging with the Colonies, Negotiations as to, *May 12*, 1222.
  - New Denominations of, Success of, *May 12*, 1222.
- Postmasters in Ireland.
  - Ferns, Wexford — Appointment of Liverpool Town Postman—Qualifications for Post, etc., *May 12*, 1153–1154.
  - Kilrush Appointment — Applications from Members of Irish Service, etc., *May 13*, 1294.

Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord—*cont.*
- Postmasters in Ireland—*cont.*
  - Return showing Irish Posts given to English Officials and *vice versâ*, granting, May 12, 1154.
- Postmen, Rural, Employing, as Assistants to Sub-Postmasters in Spare Time—Regulations, *May 6*, 645.
- Promotions, System of — Allegations of Favouritism with regard to filling up Appointments, *May 12*, 1253, 1254.
- Salaries, *see subheading* Wages.
- Sanitary Condition of Offices, *May 12*, 1170, 1171, 1257, 1258.
- Scotland.
  - Orkney Mail Service, Delays in, Reasons for, *May 10*, 892, 893.
  - Telegraph Service—Night Messengers, Salary and Pension of, *May 4*, 373.
- Sorters' Wages—Paying fortnightly, *May 9*, 761.
- Southport Office, Appointment of Postmaster's Son in—Rule as to Relatives in same office, *May 12*, 1154.
- Stamps, Books of—Objections to Charge for, Issue of higher denominations, etc., *May 12*, 1222.
- Superannuation—Employés not benefitted by the Superannuation Act, Provision for, *May 12*, 1222.
- Telegraph Service.
  - Central Office—Promotion of Learners, *May 12*, 1155.
  - France, Rate of Telegrams from Great Britain to, *May 12*, 1256.
  - Ireland.
    - Clones, Competition at—Reasons for Appointment of Unsuccessful Candidate to post, *May 16*, 1396.
    - Finnerty, M., Appointment of, to Vacancy, *May 16*, 1396.
    - Magillan Camp, Opening Office at, *May 11*, 1006-1007.
    - Valentia Harbour, Continuing Office at, during the Fishery Season, *May 12*, 1183.
  - Prepaid Reply Forms not used within three months—Refunding money, *May 12*, 1256.
  - Scotland—Night Messengers, Salary and Pension of, *May 4*, 373.
- Telephone Service.
  - District Messenger Service, Sanctioning use of Telephone Attachment to Dial proposed, *May 12*, 1267.
  - London and Brighton—Arranging for more Efficient Service, *May 16*, 1368
  - Londonderry and Limavady Extension, Cause of Delay in Commencing Works, *Apr. 29*, 15.

Stanley, Rt. Hon. Lord—*cont.*
  Telephone Service—*cont.*
    National Telephone Co.
      Negotiations with, progress of, *May 12*, 1223.
      Tunbridge Wells, Charges at, *May 5*, 521.
    Tralee, Extending Trunk System to, *May 16*, 1367.
  Wages, Committee of Inquiry into, Report of.
    Presenting to the House and Affording Opportunities for Discussion, *May 3*, 249; *May 12*, 1217–1220.
    Subjects dealt with in, *May 12*, 1220, 1221.
  Wireless Telegraphy—Racing News distributed by, Prohibition of, *May 3*, 249.

Stationery
  Expenditure on, Increase in.
    O. Sir G. Bartley, *May 16*, 1453.

Stewart, Sir M. J. McT. [Kirkcudbright]
  Education (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *May 2*, 193.

Stewart Estate, co. Tyrone
  Sale to Tenants—Progress made.
    Q. Mr. Murnaghan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 5*, 530.

Stirling-Maxwell, Sir J. M. (Glasgow, College]
  Income Tax Collection, Difference between English and Scotch Systems of, *May 2*, 98.

Stornoway
  Road to Carloway, Date of Completion of.
    O. Mr. Weir, *May 5*, 585.

Strabane, Raphoe and Convoy Railway Bill
  c. Con. May 3*, 236.
    3R.* *May 6*, 638.
  l. 1R.* *May* 9, 702.

Strachey, Sir E. [Somerset, S.]
  Lunacy Commissioners, Proceedings of—Inquiry proposed, *May* 12, 1212
  Railways—Rates and Transit Facilities.
    Committee of Inquiry, Placing Tenant Farmers on, *May 4*, 761–762.
    Milk, Carriage of—Allowing Locked Churns—Circulating Explanatory Leaflet, *May 9*, 762–763.

Street Betting Bill
  l. 2R., *May 3*, 223.
    Com., *May 10*, 867.
  Debates on Second Reading and Committee [Lords] *May 3*, 223; *May 10*, 867.
    Children under Sixteen, Provison as to, 226, 871.

Street Betting Bill—*cont.*
  Debates on Second Reading and Committee—cont.
    Facilities for Passing into Law this Session, 233, 234.
    Grounds in which Sports are carried on, Exhibition of Notices in, Prohibiting Betting, 227, 228, 230, 872–875.
    Houses Licensed for Sale of Intoxicating Liquor, Betting in, Provisions as to, 226, 230, 869, 870.
    Ireland, Application of the Bill to, 876.
    Penalties, Increase in, 226.
    Persons offending under the Act, Liability of, to Arrest and Search, 228, 871.
    "Place to which the Public have unrestricted access," Definition of, 868, 869, 871.
    Prevalence of Street Betting and Inadequacy of the Present Law, 224, 225, 229, 231–233.

Stroyan, Mr. J. [Perthshire, W.]
  Transvaal, Native Labour in.
    Native Labour Supply Association, Allegations against, *May 5*, 620.
    Treatment of Natives in Mines, *May 5*, 621, 630.

Sullivan, Mr. D. [Westmeath, S.]
  Military Works Department, Ireland—Employment of Civilian Engineers, *May 3*, 245.
  Westmeath Quarter Sessions—Notifying Jurors in the Absence of Criminal Business, *May 5*, 542.

Sunday Trading (Scotland) Bill
  c. 1R.* *May 3*, 272.

Superannuation
  Civil Service, *see that title.*

Supply
  (*See also* Army Estimates, Navy Estimates, and CivilService Estimates).
  Committee to Examine and Report on Estimates prior to Discussion, proposed—References to, in Debate on the Finance Bill, *May 16*, 1430, 1483.

Supply of Electricity Bill
  l. 2R. *May 13*, 1288.

Surrey Commercial Dock Bill
  c. Con. May 3*, 236.
    3R.* *May 6*, 638.
  l. 1R.* *May 9*, 702.

Sutton Gas Bill
  l. Rep.* *May 3*, 221.
    3R.* *May 6*, 633.

Swaziland

Customs Duties paid to Transvaal Government by the Mercantile Association, Repayment of.
  Q. Mr. J. Bailey; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 12*, 1166.

Switzerland

Trade Report Presented, *May 2*, 75.

Talbot, Rt. Hon. J. G. [Oxford University]

Licensing Bill, 2R., *May 11*, 1067.

Tarbet and Kilrush

Tourist Steamers between — Government Subsidy.
  Q. Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 3*, 254–255.

Taxation

Collection, Cost per cent. of, under the different heads of Revenue.
  Q. Mr. G. Bowles; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *May 11*, 1010.

Growing burden of, References to, in debate on the Finance Bill, *May 16*, 1410, 1411, 1438, 1444, 1463, 1491.

Quantities taxed, Receipts, &c.—Changes in upon acceptance of Budget proposals.
  Return Presented, *May 3*, 239.

Remission of—Proportion as between the Direct and Indirect Taxpayer, References to, in debate on the Finance Bill, *May 16*, 1466, 1472.

Surveyors of Taxes, Establishing Clerks to, as permanent Civil Servants.
  Q. Mr. Nannetti; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *May 16*, 1371.

War Taxes, Continuance of, in times of peace.
  Os. Mr. Dalziel, *May 3*, 304; Mr. Flynn, 304, 341; Mr. Whitley, 304; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 349.
  References to, in Debate on the Finance Bill, *May 16*, 1405, 1406, 1413, 1426, 1433, 1438, 1442, 1443, 1474, 1481.

Taylor, Mr. A. [Liverpool, E. Toxteth]

Bishoprics of Southwark and Birmingham, Bill, 2R., *May 4*, 417.

Crown Agents, Purchases by, for the Transvaal, *May 2*, 106.

Licensing Bill, 2R., *May 10*, 964, 965.

Merchant Shipping (Lighthouses) Bill, 2R., *May 13*, 1324, 1330.

Ritualistic Practices, Growth of, *May 4*, 417–421.

Taylor Mr. T. C. [Lancashire, Radcliffe]

Egypt, Condition of — Administrative Policy of Lord Cromer, *May 16*, 1494, 1495.

Finance Bill, 2R., *May 16*, 1490.

Financial Policy of the Government—Increase in Expenditure and Taxation, etc., *May 16*, 1490–1496.

Taylor, Mr. T. C.—*cont.*

Licensing Bill, 2R. *May 11*, 1062.

Post Office.
  Half-penny Local Postage, Establishment of, proposed, *May 12*, 1264.
  Parcel Post Rates to Foreign Countries, Anomalies of — Appointment of Committee of Inquiry, proposed, *May 12*, 1264.

Tea

Adulteration of — Excluding Imports of Impure Tea.
  Q. Sir S. King; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *May 2*, 101.

Duty on — Additional 2d. per pound, References to, in debate on the Finance Bill *May 16*, 1438, 1466, 1472, 1480, 1490.

Teachers

see under Education, *also title* National School Teachers, Ireland.

Telegraph Service

Central Office—Promotion of Learners.
  Q. Mr. Cremer; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 12*, 1154–1155.

France, Rate of Telegrams from Great Britain to.
  Os. Mr. L. Sinclair, *May 12*, 1224; Lord Stanley, 1256.

Ireland.
  Clones, Competition at — Reasons for Appointment of Unsuccessful Candidate to Post.
    Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 16*, 1396.
  Finnerty, Mark, Appointment of, to Vacancy.
    Q. Mr. O'Shaughnessy; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 16*, 1395–1396.
  Magillan Camp, Opening Office at, etc.
    Q. Mr. Nannetti; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 11*, 1006–1007.
  Valentia Harbour, Continuing Office at, during the Fishery Season.
    Qs. Mr. Boland, Mr. Flavin; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 12*, 1183.

Prepaid Reply Forms not used within Two Months—Refunding money, proposed.
  Os. Mr. H. Heaton, *May 12*, 1226, Lord Stanley, 1256.

Press Messages, Delay in Transmission of.
  O. Mr. Nannetti, *May 12*, 1238.

Promotions — Favouritism in filling up Appointments, alleged.
  Os. Mr. Nannetti, *May 12*, 1238–1240, 1246, 1247; Lord Stanley, 1253.

Scotland — Night Messengers, Salary and Pension of.
  Q. Mr. Leveson-Gower; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 4*, 373.

Wireless Telegraphy, *see that title.*

Telephone Service
- Ireland.
  - Londonderry and Limavady, Extension to, Cause of Delay in Commencing Works.
    - *Q.* Mr. O'Doherty; *A.* Lord Stanley, *Apr. 29*, 14–15.
  - Tralee, extending Trunk System to.
    - *Q.* Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 16*, 1367.
- London and Brighton, between—Arranging for more Efficient Service.
  - *Q.* Mr. Loder; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 16*, 1367–1368.
- National Telephone Co.
  - Negotiations with, Progress of.
    - *O.* Lord Stanley, *May 12*, 1223.
  - Tunbridge Wells, Charges at.
    - *Q.* Mr. G. Boscawen; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 5*, 520–521.

Templetown
- Postal Arrangements—Providing increased Facilities for.
  - *Q.* Mr. Ffrench; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 3*, 261–262.

Temporary Laws
- Register of, Presented, *May 5*, 519.

Tennant, Mr. H. J. [Berwickshire]
- Factories and Workshops, Fire Precautions in — Appointing Select Committee, *May 12*, 1152–1153.
- Transvaal, Labour in — Mortality of Natives in Mines, Steps taken to Check, *May 5*, 617.

Thomas, Mr. D. A. [Merthyr Tydvil]
- Canada, Immigrants into, 1902-3, Numbers and Nationalty of, *Apr. 29*, 17.
- Coal Exports—Quantity exported at Declared Values — Statistics January-March 1903, *May 2*, 98–99.
- New South Wales Birth Rate, Decline of —Tabling Committee Report, *Apr. 29*, 17.

Thompson, Dr. E. C. [Monaghan, S.]
- Congested Districts, Ireland, Scheduling Districts as, Refusal of Applications for, *May 2*, 101.
- Nurses, State Registration of, suggested, *May 2*, 97.
- Poor Law Medical Officers, Irish, Commission to Investigate Grievances of, *Apr. 29*, 12.

Thornton, Mr. P. M. [Clapham]
- Civil Service — Pensions of Temporary Clerks, *May 2*, 91.
- Post Office Copyists, Promotion of, to Assistant Clerkships — Compulsory Retirement of Senior Assistant Clerk, *May 2*, 91.

Thurles Union
- Poor Law Outdoor Relief, Refusal of Local Government Board to Sanction, alleged.
  - *Q.* Mr. K. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 2*, 122, 123.

Thurles Urban District Council Water Bill
- *l.* 2R.* *May 6*, 633.

Tibet Expedition
- Chinese Amban and Tibetan Representative, Authority of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Lambert; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *May 4*, 382.
- Expenditure incurred—Estimated Cost of Advance to Lhasa — Number of Troops to be employed.
  - *Q.* Mr. Lambert; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *May 13*, 1296–1297.
  - References to, in debate on the Finance Bill, *May 16*, 1409, 1478, 1484, 1492.
- Information as to.
  - *Q.* Lord Reay; *A.* Earl of Hardwicke, *May 9*, 704.
- Lhasa, Advance to
  - Cost, Estimated—Number of Troops to be employed.
    - *Q.* Mr. Lambert; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *May 13*, 1296–1297.
  - Date of—Location of Chinese Amban —Character of Chinese Suzerainty.
    - *Qs.* Mr. Lambert, Mr. S. Buxton; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *May 16*, 1380.
  - Discussion on—Adjournment of the House.
    - *Os.* Mr. Flynn, Mr. Lough, Mr. Lambert, Mr. Speaker, *May 12*, 1186–1187.
  - Explanation of—Chinese Sanction to Expedition—Guarding Lines of Communication, etc.
    - *Qs.* Mr. Flynn, Mr. G. Bowles, Mr. Lambert, Mr. Trevelyan, Mr. Lough; *As.* Mr. Brodrick, *May 12*, 1166–1169.
  - Sanction of, Delaying, until Arrival of Chinese Amban—Allowing Opportunity for Discussion, etc.
    - *Qs.* Mr. Trevelyan, Mr. Flynn, Mr. G. Bowles; *As.* Mr. Brodrick, *May 16*, 1378–1379.
- Papers Presented, *May 2*, 75, 89.
- Recognition of, by Dalai Lama.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Lambert; *As.* Mr. Brodrick, *May 2*, 109.
- Russia, Communications with, since Nov. 17, 1903—Tabling Papers.
  - *Q.* Mr. Bryce; *A.* Earl Percy, *May 11*, 1015.
- Strength of — Arms — Length of Communications, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. Lambert; *A.* Mr. Brodrick, *May 16*, 1379.

Tipperary
- Local Government Surcharges, enforcing.
  - *Q.* Mr. Culliman; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 5*, 540–541.

Tobacco Duties, etc.
- *Debate on Budget proposals, May 3*, 275.
  - Cigars and Cigarettes.
    - Foreign — Total Consumption in the United Kingdom, 288, 301.
    - Home Manufactured.
      - Effect of Proposed Duty on, 289, 300, 301, 314.
      - Increased Employment likely to result from Duty, 286.
      - Statistics as to, 288–9.
  - Losses to the trade, 312, 313.
  - Protectionist Duties, alleged, 276-279, 284, 287, 290, 292, 299, 303, 309, 313, 316.
  - Stripped Leaf.
    - Budget proposal, *May 3*, 275.
    - Differential Tax, etc., 281, 304.
    - Effect of the Duty on the Relative Values of Stripped and Whole Leaf Tobacco, 307, 308.
    - Increased Employment likely to result, 278, 280, 281, 292, 305, 310, 315.
    - Influence brought to bear by Importers of Unstripped Leaf — Allegations against Mr. Gallaher, etc., 281–283, 291, 293, 295–299, 302, 303, 317.
    - Stalk, Customs Rebate on, 279, 280, 292, 293, 299, 304, 309.
  - Tariff Commission — Connection between Views of, and Imposition of the Duties, 282, 283, 291, 294, 296–298, 314.
  - Unstripped.
    - Anticipations of the Budget—Increase in Imports for March, 1904, 294, 295, 312, 318, 319.
    - Drawback on, 279, 304.
- Cigars and Cigarettes.
  - Estimated Revenue from Additional Duty.
    - *Q.* Mr. Lough; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *May 3*, 248–249.
  - Foreign, Increase of Duty on, and Withdrawal from Stripped Tobacco.
    - *Q.* Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *May 2*, 112, 113.
- Drawback on Stripped Stalks.
  - *Q.* Mr. Lough; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *May 3*, 248–249.

Tobacco Duties, etc.—*cont.*
- Stripped Tobacco, Withdrawal of Duty on, and Increase on Cigars and Cigarettes, proposed.
  - *Q.* Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *May 2*, 112, 113.
- Unstripped Tobacco—Anticipations of the Budget--Increase in Imports for March, 1904.
  - *Q.* Mr. McKenna; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *May 5*, 545–546.

Tomkinson, Mr. T. [Cheshire, Crewe]
- Licensing Bill, 2R. *May 10*, 969.
- Milwr and District Mines Drainage Bill, 2R. *May 9*, 842.
  - Instruction to Committee, *May 12*, 1244.

Tomlinson, Sir W. E. M. [Preston]
- Registration of Clubs (Ireland) Bill 2R., *May 6*, 665.

Tottenham Improvement Bill
- *c.* Rep.* *Apr. 29*, 10.
  - *Con.** *May 6*, 638.
  - 3R.* *May 10*, 880.
- *l.* 1R.* *May 10*, 866.

Toulmin, Mr. G. [Bury, Lancashire]
- Census of 1901—Figures of Occupations in Scotland and Ireland—Granting Summary, *May 11*, 1009.
- Motor Vehicles, Heavy, Regulations for—Date of issue, *May 11*, 1009.
- Parcel Post—Rates on Parcels sent Abroad, Lowering, to compete with other European Countries, *May 11*, 1007.

Trade, Board of
- *President*—Mr. Gerald W. Balfour.
- *Parliamentary Secretary.*—Mr. A. Bonar Law.
- Duties, etc., Committee of Inquiry into—date of Report.
  - *Q.* Mr. C. Hay; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *May 2*, 112.

Trade and Commerce
- Foreign Countries and British possessions, Trade with.
  - Annual Statement Presented *May 16*, 1358, 1363.

Trade Marks, Designs and Patents
- Report Presented, *May 13*, 1273; *May 16* 1363.

Trade Reports
- Annual Series, Presented, *May 2*, 75, 90; *May 5*, 494, 519; *May 9*, 703, 738; *May 11*, 1004; *May 12*, 1151; *May 13*, 1271.
- Miscellaneous Series, Presented, *May 2*, 90; *May 3*, 223.

Trades Union and Trades Disputes Bill
Facilitating Passage of.
Q. Mr. Shackleton; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *May 5*, 548-549.

Training Colleges
see under Education.

Tralee
Railway to Dingle, Development Fund, Grant for.
Q. Mr. J. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 12*, 1173-1174.
Trunk Telephone System, extending to.
Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 16*, 1367.

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill
l. 1R.* *May* 3, 222.

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill
l. 1R.* *May 3*, 222.

Treasury
First Lord—Mr. A. J. Balfour.

Tredinnick Estate, Roscommon
Sale of, Expediting.
Q. Mr. Hayden; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 16*, 1389, 1390.

Trevelyan, Mr. C. P. [Yorkshire, W. R. Elland]
Macedonia—Monastir, European Consuls at—Representations ignored by the Vali, *May 3*, 247.
Private Members' Bills, Amending Standing Orders as to, *May 3*, 265.
Tibet Expedition.
Lhasa, Advance to, delaying Sanction until Arrival of Chinese Amban, etc., *May 16*, 1378, 1379.
Negotiations with Tibet, *May 12*, 1168.
Transvaal Mines, Mortality in—Date of publishing Return, *May 5*, 757.

Trinity College, Dublin
Head Rents, Redemption of—Price demanded — Average number of years purchase fixed by Land Commission, etc.
Qs. Mr. Flavin, Mr. T. W. Russell; *As.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 12*, 1180-1181; *May 16*, 1393-1394.
Lands—Commission of Inquiry into Sale —Terms of Reference.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 4*, 389-390.

Transvaal
Assets of late Government—Jameson Raid Claim.
Q. Mr. Pirie; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 3*, 245-246.

Transvaal—*cont.*
Census Return, Date of.
Qs. Maj. Seely; *As.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 2*, 107.
Chinese Labour, Importation of.
Cape Colony Legislative Assembly Resolution of, against — Terms Date of Adopting.
Qs. Mr. J. Ellis, Mr. Bayley; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 11*, 1014-1015.
Chinese Government, Position of Negotiations with.
Q. Sir J. Leng; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 12*, 1164-1165.
Commissariat Arrangements.
Q. Mr. Duncan; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 16*, 1378.
Convention, Signing of.
Q. Sir J. Leng; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 12*, 1165.
Hong Kong.
Cost of Housing intending Emigrants at, etc.
Q. Sir W. Foster; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 12*, 1165, 1166.
Plague at — Postponing Introduction of Labourers during prevalence of, etc.
Qs. Mr. Weir, Sir W. Foster, Mr. Buchanan; *As.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 9*, 756-757.
Ordinance—Correspondence Presented, *May 13*, 1271, 1293.
Transvaal Opinion on, Pledge to consider, etc.
Qs. Major Seely, Mr. E. Wason, Mr. W. Redmond; *As.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *May 3*, 263-265.
Q. Major Seely; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *May 5*, 549.
Unskilled work, Restriction to, Provision for.
Qs. Mr. H. J. Wilson, Mr. Fenwick; *As.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 2*, 107, 108.
Wages Regulations.
Q. Mr. Whitley; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 5*, 533.
Wives and Families of Labourers—Cost of Repatriation of—Regulations as to.
Qs. Mr. S. Buxton; *As.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 10*, 889, *May 12*, 1163.
Civil Service Estimates, Class 5, Total Sum expended under, 1901-2 and 1902-3.
Q. Mr. Rea; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 12*, 1158-1159.

[*cont.*

Transvaal—*cont.*

Crown Agents, Supplies purchased by.

Class of Requirements supplied, Restriction of powers of Crown Agents, etc.
Qs. Mr. Rose, Mr. H. Samuel, Mr. A. Taylor; *As.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 2*, 105–106.

Commissions paid 1900–1903.
Q. Sir H. Fowler; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 9*, 749–750.

Labour Question.

Chinese Labour, *see that sub-heading.*

Native Labour in Mines.

Conditions of — Correspondence Presented, *May 6*, 634, 643.
Doctors' Report on Disease, Tabling.
Q. Mr. H. Samuel; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 16*, 1378.

Mortality.
Q. Mr. H. Samuel; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 16*, 1377, 1378.

Date of Publishing Return.
Q. Mr. Trevelyan; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 9*, 757–758.

Rate of, and Reasons for.
Os. Major Seely, *May 5*, 594, 595, 628; Mr. Lyttelton, 613–616; Mr. H. Samuel, 624.

Steps taken to Check.
Os. *Mr.* Lyttelton, *May 5*, 614, 617; Mr. Haldane, 616; Mr. Tennant, 617.

Tabling Reports.
Qs. Major Seely, Mr. S. Buxton, Sir John Gorst; *As.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 11*, 1012–1013.

Total Number of Native Deaths 1903 — Granting Return.
Qs. Major Seely, Mr. S. Buxton, Mr. H. Samuel; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 11*, 1013–1014.

Numbers employed 1903 and 1904, Statistics as to.
Q. Mr. S. Buxton; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 12*, 1162–1163.

Recruiting Methods of the Native Labour Supply Association.
Os. Mr. W. Churchill, *May 5*, 599, 600; Mr. Lyttelton, 599, 600, 611; Mr. J. Stroyan, 620; Mr. Bell, 625.

Transvaal—*cont.*

Labour Question—*cont.*

Native Labour in Mines—*cont.*

Treatment of.

Blue-books.

Cape of Good Hope Blue-book G. 4. 1904—Date of Tabling.
Q. Major Seely; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 11*, 1012.

Date of Issue.
Os. Earl of Carrington, Duke of Marlborough, *May 10*, 876.

Evidence of.
Os. Major Seely, *May 5*, 593; Mr. W. Churchill, 595–597; Mr. Lyttelton, 607–609, 616; Mr. J. Ellis, 617, 618; Mr. H. Samuel, 622.

Brownlee, Mr., Evidence of.
Os. Major Seely, *May 5*, 593; Mr. W. Churchill, 596–600; Mr. Lyttelton, 607, 608, 611–613; Mr. H. Samuel, 623.

Cruelty, Allegations of.
Os. Major Seely, *May 5*, 593, 594; Mr. W. Churchill, 596–598, 602, 603; Mr. Lyttelton, 612; Mr. J. Ellis, 618; Mr. J. Stroyan, 621; Mr. H. Samuel, 623, 624; Mr. Bell, 625.

Government Action proposed.
Q. Major Seely; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 5*, 549–550.

Responsibility of the British Government.
Os. Mr. W. Churchill, *May 5*, 604, 605; Mr. J. Ellis, 619.

Sick Labourers not allowed to return Home, alleged.
Os. Mr. W. Churchill, *May 5*, 602, Mr. Lyttelton, 609, Mr. H. Samuel, 623.

Sunday Work Compulsory, alleged.
Os. Mr. W. Churchill, *May 5*, 602.

[*cont.*

Transvaal—*cont.*
Labour Question—*cont.*
Native Labour in Mines—*cont.*
Treatment of—*cont.*
Wages, unfair treatment with regard to.
Os. Major Seely, *May 5*, 593, 594 ; Mr. W. Churchill, 598–600, 602 ; Mr. Lyttelton, 609 ; Mr. J. Ellis, 618 ; Mr. H. Samuel, 623 ; Mr. Bell, 625.
Papers relating to, Delay in Publication of.
Os. Mr. Lyttelton, Mr. J. Ellis, *May 5*, 608, 609 ; Mr. Bell, 627.
White Labour in Mines, Proportion of, before and since the War.
Q. Major Seely ; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 2*, 107.
Loan, Guaranteed, Issuing Remainder of.
Q. Sir E. Vincent ; *A.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *May 4*, 377.
Magistracy, Return relative to, Date of Presenting.
Q. Mr. J. Ellis ; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 11*, 1015.
Mines.
Gold Output, Statistics as to—Kaffirs Employed.
Qs. Mr. S. Buxton ; *As.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 4*, 378–379 ; *May 9*, 751–752
Labour in, *see subheading* Labour Question.
Swaziland Mercantile Association, Customs Duties Paid by, Refunding.
Q. Mr. J. Bailey ; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 12*, 1166.

Tuam
District Nurse O'Connor, Augmenting Salary of.
Q. Mr. Reddy ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 4*, 389.

Tuberculosis in Animals
Bovine—Report of Royal Commission—Date of Issue, etc,
Q. Mr. Field ; *A.* Mr. G. Lawson, *May 11*, 1017.
Compensation for Farmers in Respect of—Appointing Select Committee, etc.
Q. Mr. Channing ; *A.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *May 16*, 1398.

Tuke, Sir J. B. [Edinburgh and St. Andrew's Universities]
Education [Scotland] Bill, 2R., *May 2*, 176.
Lunacy.
Commissioners, Constitution and Duties of — Comparison with Scottish System, etc., *May 12*, 1188–93.

Tuke, Sir J. B.—*cont.*
Lunacy—*cont.*
Inquiry into whole Question of, proposed, *May 12*, 1195.
Institutions for Treatment of Incipient Cases, Establishment of, proposed, *May 12*, 1193, 1194.

Tullaghan
Congested Districts Board, Failure of, to Accede to Application from, alleged.
Q. Mr. P. A. McHugh ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 10*, 897.

Tunbridge Wells
National Telephone Company's Charges at.
Q. Mr. G. Boscawen ; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 5*, 520–521.

Turf
Theft of, from Kellysgrove Bog—Excessive Sentence Imposed at Ballinasloe Petty Sessions,
Q. Mr. Roche ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 12*, 1177.

Turkey
Trade Report Presented, *May 9*, 703 ; *May 13*, 1271.

Tweedmouth, Lord
Macedonian Crisis — Progress made in Reforms, etc., *May 5*, 513.
Rifles, New Service, Cost, etc., *May 13*, 1273, 1283, 1284.

Twelve O'Clock Rule, Suspension of
Proceedings on Reports of Committee of Ways and Means.
Motion [Mr. A. J. Balfour] *May 3*, 272.

Tyne
River Police Force, Refusal of Certificate to, under Act of 1890—Correspondence Presented, *May 6*, 634, 643.

Ultimus Haeres (Scotland)
Receipts and Payments and List of Estates Administered (1903)
Return Ordered, *May 9*, 739 ; Presented, *May 12*, 1150.

United Irish League
Resolution of, to compel Sales by Landlords before May Rents become Due, alleged.
Os. Lord Muskerry, *May 10*, 876 ; Earl of Denbigh, Lord Clonbrock, 877 ; Earl of Cork, 878.

United States
Smoke Nuisance, Legislation regarding—Tabling Reports.
Q. Mr. Bryce ; *A.* Earl Percy, *May 16*, 1380–1381.
Trade Report Presented, *May 13*, 1271.

Universities
- Ireland—Royal University, Alteration in Statutes of—Royal Warrant of Approval Presented *May 2*, 76, 91.
- Oxford and Cambridge—Statutes made by Governing Bodies, Presented, *Apr. 29*, 4, 11, 12.
- Scotland—St. Andrew's—Annual Statistical Report Presented *May 9*, 703, 704, 738.

University College, London
- Dogs Vivisected in 1903—Number.
  - *Q.* Dr. Shipman; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *May 4*, 375.

University of Leeds Bill
- *c.* Rep.* *May 12*, 1146.

Ure, Mr. A. [Linlithgow]
- Education [Scotland] Bill, 2R., *May 2*, 202.
- Law Courts, Scotland—Lack of Accommodation in, etc., *May 5*, 565.

Vagrancy
- Ireland—Vice-regal Commission on Poor-Laws—Terms of Reference, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. H. Law; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 10*, 895-896.

Valentia Harbour
- Telegraph Office at, Continuing, during the Fishery Season.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Boland, Mr. Flavin; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 12*, 1183.

Valuation Bill
- Allowing Time for Full Consideration of.
  - *Q.* Mr. H. J. Wilson; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *May 9*, 741-742.

Vans
- Covered, London County Council Byelaw as to—Issuing Regulations to Police—Proceedings against Messrs. Carter, Paterson and Co.
  - *Q.* Mr. Causton; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *May 16*, 1383.

Victoria
- Electoral Districts and Provinces Boundaries Acts, Presented *May 5*, 518; *May 6*, 634.

Victoria University of Manchester Bill
- *c.* Rep.* *Apr. 29*, 10.
- 3R.* *May 4*, 369.

Vincent, Sir E. [Exeter]
- Transvaal—Guaranteed Loan, Issuing Remainder of, *May 4*, 377.

Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. H. [Sheffield, Central]
- Indian Army, Organisation of—Tabling Lord Kitchener's Memorandum, proposed, *May 16*, 1371.
- Volunteers—Artillery, New Guns for, Number of Batteries Re-armed, etc., *May 10*, 888.

Vivisection
- *see* Animals—Experiments on.

Volunteers
- Artillery, New Guns for, Number of batteries Re-armed, etc.
  - *Q.* Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *May 10*, 888.
- Camps—Manchester 2nd Battalion, Suitable Training Ground for.
  - *Q.* Mr. Schwann; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *May 3*, 244-245.
- Commission, Report of—Proposed Government Action.
  - *Q.* Mr. R. Lucas; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *Apr. 29*, 16-17.
  - *Q.* Sir C. Dilke; Mr. Arnold Forster, *May 4*, 381.
  - War Office Re-organisation, Effect of, on Report.
    - *Q.* Capt. Norton; *A.* Mr. B. Davenport, *May 9*, 755.
- Courts of Inquiry — Particulars as to Courts held 1903-4.
  - *Q.* Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *May 3*, 243.
- Fusiliers, Royal, 1st Battalion, Court of Inquiry in—Taking Evidence on Oath.
  - *Q.* Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *May 13*, 1298.
- Retired Sergeants—Regulations as to wearing Uniform.
  - *Q.* Sir F. Flannery; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *May* 9, 748.
- South African War—Number of Volunteers in Imperial Yeomanry during.
  - *Q.* Mr. S. Ormsby-Gore; *A.* Mr. Arnold Forster, *May 2*, 105.

Vote Office
- Ventilation, Use of Coal Fire, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. Weir; *A.* Lord Balcarres, *May 2*, 117.

Wales
- Education, *see* Education—Wales.
- Historical Manuscripts—Reports of Royal Commission.
  - *Q.* Mr. A. Davies; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *May 5*, 538.

Waltham Abbey Ordnance Factory
- Poisoning of Fish in River Lea by Outflow from—Steps to be taken.
  - *Q.* Col. Lockwood; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *May 16*, 1374.

Walton, Mr. J. [Yorkshire, W.R., Barnsley]
- Finance Bill, 2R., *May 16*, 1464.
- Financial Policy of the Government—Increase in Expenditure and Taxation, etc., *May 16*, 1464–1470.

Warner, Mr. T. C. T. [Staffordshire, Lichfield]
- Beer, Excise Duties—Higher Tax on Beer sold in Tied Houses, proposed, *May 3*, 336.

War Office
Secretary of State—Mr. H. O. Arnold-Forster.
Under Secretary—Earl of Donoughmore.
Financial Secretary—Mr. W. Bromley-Davenport.
Reconstitution, Effect of, on Report of Royal Commission on Militia and Volunteers.
Q. Capt. Norton ; *A.* Mr. B. Davenport, *May 9*, 755.

Wason, Mr. E. [Clackmannan and Kinross]
Transvaal
Chinese Labour, Importation of, Transvaal Protests against, *May 3*, 265.

Wason, Mr. J. C. [Orkney and Shetland]
Congested Districts Board, Work of, *May 5*, 552.
Herring Fisheries, Provision of Motor Power for Fleets, proposed, *May 5*, 552.
Lobsters, Boiling of, Alive, in Restaurants, alleged, *May 2*, 126.
Merchant Shipping (Lighthouses) Bill, 2R., *May 13*, 1320.
Motor Cars.
Hyde Park, Speed in, *May 2*, 116.
Record-breaking Tours—Police Supervision, *May 2*, 116, 119.
Orkney.
Mail Service, Delays in, Reasons for, *May 10*, 892, 893.
Road Construction in, Delays, *May 5*, 553.
Post Office.
Cash on Delivery System, Objections to, *May 12*, 1261.
Lottery Circulars, Suppression of, proposed, *May 12*, 1260, 1261.
Orkney Mails, Irregularities in Delivery of, *May 12*, 1262.
Sunday Deliveries, Objections to, *May 12*, 1261.
Whalers, Norwegian—Practice of Throwing Carcases out to Sea, Steps taken to prevent, *May 5*, 554.

Waterford
Bridge, New, at—Estimated Cost—Government and Local Contributions.
Q. Mr. W. Moore ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 13*, 1297.
Evicted Tenants in, Applications from—Granting Return.
Q. Mr. Power ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 5*, 531-532.

Water Orders Confirmation Bill
l. 1R.* *May 2*, 74, 75.

Ways and Means
Proceedings on Reports of Committee—Suspension of Twelve o'clock Rule.
Motion (Mr. A. J. Balfour) *May 3*, 272.

Weights and Measures Bill
c. Rep.* *May 10*, 899.

Weights and Measures (Metric System) Bill
l. Report from Select Committee Presented, *May 5*, 496.
Com.* *May 13*, 1273.
Rep., *May 16*, 1359.

Weir, Mr. J. G. [Ross and Cromarty]
Animals, Experiments on — Scientific Results Obtained during past year, *May 16*, 1382.
Avoch, Ross-shire—Government Grant for Harbour, *May 5*, 525 ; *May 10*, 894 ; *May 16*, 1364.
Barvas, Destitution in, Consequent on Failure of Crops—Relief Works proposed, *May 2*, 119.
Congested Districts Board.
Constitution and Work of, *May 5*, 582.
Holdings for Crofters and Cottars, Purchase of, *May 5*, 583.
Report of, *May 5*, 583, 584.
Congested Districts (Scotland) Bill—Date of Introducing, *May 2*, 126.
Crosbost, Burying Ground of—Acquisition of New Ground, *May 2*, 118.
Deer Forests.
Area of, Extension of, *May 5*, 559, 560.
Returns as to, inaccuracy of, *May 5*, 559.
Dog Licences—Fines, Average Amount of, Number of Persons Fined, etc., *May 10*, 891.
Engineer to the Scottish Office—Inefficiency of Work, *May 5*, 561-562.
Erbusaig School, Steps to Remedy Unsatisfactory Water Supply at, *May 16*, 1364.
Fisheries.
Assistance to, by the Congested Districts Board, proposed, *May 5*, 587.
"Goldseeker"—Quantity of Fish Sold in April—Names of Places of Sale, etc., *May 12*, 1172.
North Sea—International Committee—Treasury Contribution towards Scottish Expenditure, etc., *May 5*, 537.
Report of Board, Date of Publication, *May 16*, 1364.
Highlands.
Agricultural Produce—Transit Facilities, Rates Charged, etc., *May 5*, 560, 561.

[*cont.*

Weir, Mr. J. G.—*cont.*
  Highlands and Island.
    Crofting Counties.
      Deaths in, Laxity in Certification. Introducing Legislation, *May 16*, 1397, 1398.
      Inspectors of the Poor — Age Limit and Medical Inspection for Appointments, *May 12*, 1172.
  "Jackal," H.M.S.
    North Sea, Temperature of, Cruises to ascertain — Remuneration to Captain, Amount of, *May 10*, 889.
    Police Duties of—Substitute proposed during Absence on Research Work, *May, 16*, 1377.
  Lewis, Island of.
    Carloway and Stornoway, Road between—Date of Completion, *May 5*, 585.
    Equivalent Grant, Allocation of — Maintenance of Footpaths and Bridges, etc., *May 12*, 1172–1173.
    Gravir and Cromore Road—Cost of, Inefficiency of Government Survey, etc., *May 5*, 562.
    Holdings for Crofters—Necessity for purchase of land, *May 5*, 584.
  Licensed Premises and Licences Refused, Granting Return relative to, *May 9*, 740.
  Lochcarron Defective Water Supply, Remedying, Proposed, *May 2*, 118.
  Post Office.
    Motor Services of, Extension of, Proposed, *May 12*, 1259.
    Superannuation of Employees not benefited by the Superannuation Act, Provision for, *May 12*, 1259.
  Smallpox Experiments—Inoculation of Dogs at Joyce Green Hospital, *May 10*, 893.
  Transvaal, Importation of Chinese Labour to—Plague at Hong Kong, postponing Importation during Prevalence of, *May 9*, 756.
  Unclaimed Dividends on Government Stock, Appropriation of to pay off Budget deficit, *May 3*, 364.
    Stockholders, efforts made to trace, *May 10*, 890, 891.
  Vote Office, Ventilation of, Use of coal fire, etc., *May 2*, 117.

Weir Estate, Sligo
  Administration of—Sale of Knocalassa Grazing Farm.
    Q. Mr. O'Dowd ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 9*, 766, 767.

Wellington (Somerset) Gas Bill
  l. 3R.* *May 5*, 494.
  c. Lords' Amendts. *con.** *May 10*, 880.

West Indies
  Jamaica—Matches, Excise duty on.
    Q. Mr. McKenna ; *A.* Mr. Lyttelton, *May 2*, 108, 109.

Westmeath
  Quarter Sessions—Notifying Jurors in the Absence of Criminal Business.
    Q. Mr. Sullivan ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 5*, 542, 543.

West Metropolitan Railway (Abandonment) Bill
  c. Rep.* *Apr. 29*, 10.
    *Con.** *May 6*, 638.
    3R.* *May 10*, 880.
  l. Commons Amendts. *con**. *May 13*, 1270.

Weston-super-Mare Grand Pier Bill
  c. 3R.* *Apr. 29*, 10.

West Riding Tramways Bill
  l. Report from Select Committee, *May 2*, 73.
    3R.* *May 9*, 702.
  c. 1R.* *May 10*, 881.

Whales
  Hunting of, off the Coast of Scotland, Damage done to Herring Fisheries by, etc.
    Os. Mr. Asher, *May 5*, 563, 564 ; Capt. Ellice, Mr. Harmsworth, 565 ; Mr. Maconochie, 566 ; Mr. A. G. Murray, 567, 568.
  Norwegian Whalers in Scotch Waters, Practice of Throwing Carcases out to Sea—Steps taken to Prevent, etc.
    Os. Mr. C. Wason, *May 5*, 554 ; Mr. Asher, 563 ; Capt. Ellice, 565 ; Mr. Maconochie, 566 ; Mr. A. G. Murray, 568.

Wharton, Rt. Hon. J. L. [York, W.R., Ripon]
  Licensing Bill, 2R., *May 9*, 829 ; *May 11*, 1037.

Whisky
  Irish, Foreign Spirit sold as—Communication from Co. Wexford Agricultural Society.
    Q. Sir T. Esmonde ; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 5*, 531.
  Tax on, Continuance of, Protests against.
    Os. Mr. Flynn, *May 3*, 341-342 ; Sir E. Durning-Lawrence, 342 ; Mr. S. Young, 343 ; Sir F. Banbury, 344 ; Mr. J. F. Hope, 344-347.
    Ireland, Burden imposed on, by.
      Os. Mr. Flynn, *May 3*, 342 ; Mr. J. F. Hope, 347.

Whitby Gas Bill
  l. Rep.* *May 5*, 493.
    3R.* *May 13*, 1270.

White, Mr. G. [Norfolk, N.W.]
  Crown Agents for the Colonies—Transactions for 1903—Granting Return showing Nature, Date, etc., of each Transaction, *May 12*, 1163.
  Licensing Bill, 2R., *May 9*, 826.

Whiteley, Mr. G. [Yorkshire, W. R. Pudsey]
  Friendly Societies, Unregistered, Debarring from Income Tax Recovery, *May 5*, 536-537; *May 10*, 891, 892.

Whitley, Mr. J. H. [Halifax]
  Bishoprics of Southwark and Birmingham Bill, 2R., *May 4*, 445.
  Beer, Excise Duties on—Higher Tax on Beer Sold in Tied Houses, Proposed, *May 3*, 335
  Law Officers of the Crown, English and Irish—Fees and Salaries, *May 5*, 522.
  Taxation—War taxes, Protest against continuance of in time of peace, *May 3*, 304.
  Transvaal, Importation of Chinese Labour to—Wages Regulations, *May 5*, 533.
  Unclaimed dividends on Government Stock, appropriation of to pay off Budget deficit, *May 3*, 355.

Whitmore, Mr. C. A. [Chelsea]
  Duke of York's Military School—Disposal of Site, *May 12*, 1162.

Whitsuntide Recess
  Adjournment of House of Lords.
    Os. Earl Spencer, Marquess of Lansdowne, *May 6*, 637.

Whittaker, Mr. T. P. [Yorkshire, W. R., Spen Valley]
  Licensing Bill, 2R., *May 9*, 801, 802, 818, 819, 824, 862; *May 11*, 1084.

Wild Birds Protection Act
  Publishing Clearer Notices under.
    Q. Mr. Pirie; *A.* Mr. A. G. Murray, *May 13*, 1294.

Williams, Col. R. [Dorset, W.]
  Licensing Bill, 2R., *May 9*, 851.

Willoughby d'Eresby, Lord [Lincolnshire, Horncastle]
  Post Office — Cash-on-Delivery System, Introduction of, *May 3*, 241.

Wilson, Mr. F. W. [Norfolk, Mid]
  Medical Officer of Health, Whole Time, Granting Return of Counties having appointed, *May 12*, 1156.

Wilson, Mr. H. J. [Yorkshire, W.R., Holmfirth]
  Transvaal, Importation of Chinese Labour to—Unskilled Work, Provisions for restriction to, *May 2*, 107, 108.
  Valuation Bill, Allowing Time for full consideration of, *May 9*, 741.

Wireless Telegraphy
  Lighthouses, Delay in installation of system.
    O. Major Jameson, *May 13*, 1343.
  Racing News, Prohibiting distribution of,
    Q. Mr. Montagu; *A.* Lord Stanley, *May 3*, 249.

Wolverhampton Corporation Bill
  l. 2R.* *May 10*, 865.

Wolverton, Lord
  Light Load Line—Failure of Board of Trade to carry out recommendations of Select Committee, *May 2*, 81.
  Loading-port clause in Ships' Articles, Interpretation of, *May 3*, 235.
  Merchant Shipping Bill, 2R., *May 9*, 722, 734.
  Supply of Electricity Bill, 2R., *May 13*, 1288.

Wood, Mr. J. [Down, E.]
  Army—Royal Irish Rifles, 5th Battalion—Training at Downpatrick, *May 12*, 1184.
  Londonderry Post Office.
    Alterations, Date of commencing, Proposed, etc., *May 11*, 1008.
    Learners, qualified, without Appointments—Providing Situations for, etc., *May 11*, 1007.

Woodhouse, Sir J. T. [Huddersfield]
  Licensing Bill, 2R., *May 9*, 793, 797.

Woollen Factories
  Inspection, Machinery, etc., of, Return ordered, *May 2*, 90.

Woolwich Arsenal
  Suspended Workmen — Payment of Bonuses.
    Q. Capt. Norton; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *May 5*, 534-535.

Workhouses
  Classification of inmates and provision of separate accommodation for imbeciles, etc., Proposed
    Os. Mr. J. Hutton, *May 6*, 675, 676; Mr. Crooks, 684, 685.
  Cottage Homes System, Working of
    O. Mr. Crooks, *May 6*, 685, 686.
  Ireland.
    Armagh—Master's Salary, Reason for raising, etc.
      Q. Mr. J. Campbell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 5*, 542.
    Granard—Dismissal of Master—Reasons, etc.
      Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 16*, 1385–1386.
    Hospitals—Obligation to admit Military Patients.
      Q. Mr. J. P. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Wyndham, *May 3*, 256.

[*cont.*

Workhouses—*cont.*
- Nursing of Sick in—Recommendations of committee, issuing General Order Consequent on.
  - *Q.* Sir Harry Samuel; *A.* Mr. W. Long, *May 16*, 1366.

Working Classes, Housing of
- *See* Housing of the Working Classes.

Workmen's Compensation Act, 1897
- Bill to amend, Proposed—Progress of Inquiry.
  - *Q.* Mr. S. Evans; *A.* Mr. A. Douglas, *May 16*, 1382.

Works
- *First Commissioner*—Lord Windsor.

Works, Board of
- Irish, Act establishing, Money spent by, etc.
  - *Q.* Sir T. Esmonde; *A.* Mr. V. Cavendish, *Apr. 29*, 15–16.

Worsley-Taylor, Mr. H. W. [Lancashire, Blackpool]
- Licensing Bill, 2R., *May 10*, 907.

Worsted Factories
- Inspection, Machinery, &c., of, Return ordered, *May 2*, 90.

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. G.
- *Chief Secretary for Ireland* [Dover]
- Achonry
  - Estate of Capt. Armstrong, Purchase of by Congested Districts Board, *May 2*, 122.
  - Schools—Name of Manager—Appointing Rev. B. Dunn, P.P., etc., *May 9*, 767; *May 12*, 1175.
- Agrarian Offences—Discontinuing Returns *May 4*, 393.
- Agricultural and Technical Instruction Department.
  - Directory, Consulting Local Technical Commitees as to, *May 9*, 769.
  - Funds disbursed—Total Amount to Mar. 31st, 1903, etc., *May 9*, 747.
  - Galloway Bulls, Purchase of under Live Stock Schemes, *May 4*, 391.
  - Munster Dairy School, Allocation of Grant for, *May 4*, 394.
  - Report, Annual—showing Distribution of Funds among each Province and County, etc., *May 13*, 1298.
  - St. Louis Exhibition, Exhibits at, *May 4*, 389.
  - Veterinary Branch.
    - Compulsory Residence of Officers in Districts, *May 5*, 532.
    - Officials transferred from—Names, Salaries, etc.—Return proposed, *May 10*, 896.

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. G.—*cont.*
- Aughris—Facilities afforded for development of fishing industry—Scheduling as congested district, Proposed, *May 10*, 895.
- Avondale Estate, Wicklow, Purchasers of, *May 4*, 391.
- Ballaghamechan and Tullaghan, Delay in Establishment of Parish Committees at, *May 10*, 897.
- Ballinasloe Lunatic Asylum, Medical Superintendent—Appointment of Dr. Kirwan, Delay in Sanctioning, etc., *May 5*, 531; *May 6*, 648; *May 9*, 773; *May 16*, 1386–1387.
- Ballymahon Magisterial Bench, Appointing Roman Catholic to Vacancy on, *May 3*, 255–256.
- Ballyvarley, Co. Down—Sunday Hurling Matches, Disturbances as to—Instituting Prosecutions, *May 9*, 769.
- Banbridge, Disturbances at—Prosecution of Rioters, etc., *May 9*, 773; *May 11*, 1019–1021; *May 16*, 1392, 1393.
- Barrow River, Inspection of, *May 13*, 1297.
- Bloomfield Estate, Sale of—Name of Owner, etc., *May 2*, 121.
- Borrissoleigh Band, Securing from Police Interference—Relieving District from Burden of Extra Police, etc., *May 16*, 1395.
- Butter—Railway Rates to English Markets, *May 9*, 765.
- Cahirciveen River—Authority responsible for placing Buoys and Perches in Estuary, *May 16*, 1385.
- Carrickfergus, Sewage Nuisance near, Steps to remedy, *May 9*, 747.
- Colclough Estate, Wexford, Expediting Sale of to Tenants, *May 3*, 255.
- Congested Districts.
  - Aughris, Scheduling of, Proposed—Facilities afforded for Development of Fishing Industry, etc., *May 10*, 895.
  - Scheduling Districts as, Refusal of Applications for, *May 2*, 101.
- Congested Districts Board—Ballaghamechan and Tullaghan, Delay in Establishment of Parish Committees at, *May 10*, 897.
- Constabulary.
  - Bands performing in Public, Interference with—Cases of Meetings disturbed, etc., *May 11*, 1018–1021; *May 16*, 1395.
  - Belcoo Force, Discharging Duties of neighbouring Stations, *May 16*, 1390.
  - Compensation for Injuries done by—Case of Mr. W. M'Gifford, *May 5*, 530–531.
  - Discipline of, Newspaper Controversy regarding, Right of Magistrates to engage in, *May 9*, 764.

[*cont.*

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. G.—*cont.*

Constabulary—*cont.*

Fermanagh, Abolishing Stations in certain Rural Districts of, *May 12*, 1182.

Gallagher, Sergeant, Pension of, *May 9*, 765.

Galway, Extra Police Charges remitted in —Distinguishing from case of Armagh, *May 16*, 1374.

Irish Guards.

Inducements offered to enlist in, *May 11*, 1019.

Reservists from, Admission of, *May 9*, 768.

Longford Barracks—Temporary Prisoners — Improving Places of Detention, *May 4*, 394.

Public House Property, Constables having an interest in—Stationing in another county, *May 9*, 772.

Temperance Society joined by Constable Scully — Resignation of members—Directing him to withdraw, *May 11*, 1022.

County Surveyor's and Secretary's Offices, Pension claims of clerks in, *May 16*, 1373.

Crimes Act of 1887, Repeal of, Proposed, *May 4*, 478, 479, 483, 484.

Cusack Estate, Longford — Progress of Sale—Return showing Names of Intending Purchasers, etc., *May 4*, 388.

Curtin, M., Death of, in Prison, Action of magistrate in refusing bail—Comment of coroner's jury, *May 11*, 1025-1026 ; *May 16*, 1392.

Development Fund, Items of Supplementary Estimate for—Date of Tabling, etc., *May 12*, 1173–1175.

Dublin.

Bicycle Thefts in, Statistics as to *May 16*, 1388.

College of Science—Appointment of Architect—Consulting Irish Departments, etc., *May 16*, 1388.

Marlborough Street Training College —Granting Return as to Students, *May 6*, 647.

Meath Hospital (County Infirmary)— Medical Staff—Election to Vacancies, *May* 6, 644.

Trinity College.

Head Rents, Price demanded for redemption of—Scale fixed by Land Commission, etc., *May 12*, 1180–1181 ; *May 16*, 1393, 1394.

Lands — Commission of Inquiry into Sale—Terms of Reference, *May 4*, 390.

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. G.—*cont.*

Dundrum.

Estate of the Earl de Montalt—Date of hearing Fair Rent Appeals, *May 16*, 1386.

Petty Sessions — Appointing additional magistrates, *May 5*, 544.

Dunmanway Electoral Division—Dividing into two divisions, *May 5*, 532.

Edge Estate, Queen's Co.—Progress of sale —Provision for Thos. M'Cormack, *May 5*, 541.

Education.

Achonry Schools—Name of Manager —Appointing Rev. B. Dunn, P.P., etc., *May 9*, 767 ; *May 12*, 1175.

Blackrock Secondary Schools,provision of funds for—Committee Resolutions, *May 4*, 390.

Building Grants, Applications for since 1901, etc.—Applications rejected, etc.—Decision as to Building Plans, *May 12*, 1176-1177.

Evening Schools — Grants, Regulations as to, *May 10*, 897.

Mount Bellew—School built by private effort—Sanctioning expenditure for Technical Instruction, *May 12*, 1178.

School Attendance Committees, Reasons for debarring teachers from acting as secretaries to, *May 16*, 1372.

Training Colleges.

Development Fund Grants for, *May 12*, 1173-1174.

Free Homes for—Resolution of Roman Catholic Bishops, *May 3*, 253.

King's Scholars, estimated Increase in Number of, owing to increased Grants, *May 5*, 543–544.

Marlborough Street — Granting Return dealing with Students, *May 6*, 647.

St. Patrick's—Delay in awarding Teaching Diplomas, *May 12*, 1161.

Emigration Statistics, 1903 — Holding Commission of Inquiry, *May 3*, 252.

Evictions.

Carlow—Names of Tenants making Applications for Restoration, etc., *May 12*, 1160.

Edge Estate, Queen's Co., Sale of— Provision for Thos. M'Cormack, *May 5*, 541.

Kerry, Evicted Tenants in.

Number, and Number of Restorations under the Land Act of 1903, *May 12*, 1175–1176.

[*cont.*

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. G.—*cont.*
- Evictions—*cont.*
  - Kerry, Evicted Tenants in.
    - Re-instatement, Steps taken towards, *May 16*, 1389.
  - Kildare Property of the Marquess of Drogheda — Re-instatement of Evicted Tenants, *May 12*, 1182.
  - Settlement of Tenants—Inspector to report on Properties for sale, *May 3*, 257.
  - Waterford — Applications for Re-instatement — Granting Return, *May 5*, 531.
- Fair Rent Appeals.
  - Dundrum Estate, date of hearing, *May 16*, 1386.
  - Powerscourt Estate—Date of completing Cases, *May 12*, 1152.
- Fisheries.
  - Close Season off Donegal Coast, extending area affected, *Apr. 29*, 16.
  - Cooscroum Landing Place—Date of commencing Work, *May 5*, 540.
  - Dingle Union, Need for larger Piers—Sending Inspector to Report, *May 11*, 1023.
  - Fishermen's Insurance Scheme, Delay in putting into operation, *May 5*, 540.
  - Rossbeg, Landing Accommodation at, Providing additional, *May 3*, 254.
  - South East Coast—Improvement of Piers, *May 4*, 390.
- Florence Knox Estate, Mayo—Purchase of untenanted lands by Estates Commissioners, *May 9*, 767.
- Galbraith Estate, Tyrone—Purchase by Commissioners—Considering Tenants' Applications, *May 4*, 394.
- Galway, Extra Police Charges in—Distinguishing from the case of Armagh, *May 16*, 1374.
- Garryhinch Estate, Queen's Co.—Date of placing in Land Judge's Court—Steps to effect a sale, *May 9*, 764.
- Granard Workhouse—Dismissal of Master—Reasons, etc., *May 16*, 1385-1386.
- Gun Licences—Martin Jennings, Reason for depriving of Gun, etc., *May 11*, 1021.
- Housing of the Working Classes.
  - Farmers, small—Making Provision in Labourers (Ireland) Bill, *May 11*, 1017.
  - Legislation proposed, *May 2*, 121.
- Irish Society of London—Yearly Receipts and Expenditure 1882 to 1904—Granting Return, *May 12*, 1159-1160.
- Kenmare Estate—Proposed Sale by Townlands — Power of Commissioners to sanction Scheme, *May 12*, 1179.

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. G.—*cont.*
- Kildare Property of the Marquess of Drogheda — Sale to Tenants — Re-instatement of Evicted Tenants, *May 12*, 1182.
- Kilkee, Sanitary Authority for—Appointment of Officers, *May 12*, 1161.
- Kilkeel Petty Sessions—Difficulty in obtaining Evidence of Dispensary Doctor—Adjournment of Case, *May 9*, 771.
- Killanin, Lord, Property of—Purchase by Tenants—Acquiring Grazing Farm to enlarge Holdings, *May 9*, 765.
- Kingston Estate, Cork—Sale to Tenants—Terms of Sale—Instituting Inquiries, etc., *May 11*, 1023-1024.
- Labourers Acts.
  - Fishermen, including, under the Acts, proposed, *May 10*, 894, 895.
  - Unexpended Balance of Exchequer Contribution, Application of, *May 9*, 766.
- Labourers' Cottages.
  - Expense of Scheme under Labourers (Ireland) Bill—Inserting Compensation Clause, *May 4*, 392, 393.
  - Return relating to, cause of delay in publication of, *May 16*, 1388.
- Labourers (Ireland) Bill.
  - Cottage Scheme, Expense of, under—Inserting Compensation Clause, *May 4*, 392, 393
  - Date of Second Reading, *May 12*, 1184.
  - Housing — Introducing Provisions, *May 11*, 1017.
  - Maximum Rating Limit, Question of increasing—Application of unexpended Balance of Exchequer Contribution, *May 4*, 392.
- Land Act (1903)—Amendment Bill—Date of Second Reading, *May 12*, 1184.
- Land Commission.
  - Commissioner Acting in a District in which he has Personal Interests, Regulations as to—Case of Mr. G. Bolster, *May 16*, 1374.
  - Head Rent, Redemption of, Scale fixed for—Powers with regard to Trinity College, *May 12*, 1180-1181.
  - Report, Annual—Date of Publication, Including Report from Estates Commissioners, *May 3*, 256, 257; *May 9*, 771-772.
- Land Purchase.
  - Achonry Estate, purchase of by Congested Districts Board, *May 2*, 122.
  - Avondale Estate, Wicklow, Purchasers of, *May 4*, 391.
  - Bloomfield Estate, Sale of—Name of Owner, etc., *May 2*, 121.
  - Colclough Estate, Wexford, Expediting Sale of to Tenants, *May 3*, 255.

[*cont.*

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. G.—*cont.*
Land Purchase—*cont.*
Cusack Estate, Longford—Progress of Sale—Return showing Names of intending Purchasers, etc., *May 4*, 388.
Edge Estate, Queen's Co.—Progress of Sale — Provision for Thos. M'Cormack, *May 5*, 541.
Estates Commissioners' Rules, Tabling, *May 5*, 541-542.
Florence Knox Estate, Mayo—Purchase of Untenanted Lands by the Commissioners, *May 9*, 767.
Future Tenants, Purchase of Holdings by—Remedy against Exorbitant Demands, *May 9*, 763.
Galbraith Estate, Tyrone—Purchase by Commissioners — Considering Tenants' Applications, *May 4*, 394.
Garryhinch Estate, Queen's Co.—Steps to Effect a Sale—Date of placing in Land Judge's Court, *May 9*, 764.
Kenmare Estate—Proposed Sale by Townlands—Power of Commissioners to sanction Scheme, *May 12*, 1179.
Kildare, Property of the Marquess of Drogheda, Sale of, to Tenants—Reinstating Evicted Tenants, *May 12*, 1182.
Killanin, Lord, Property of—Purchase by Tenants—Acquiring Grazing Farm to enlarge Holdings, *May 9*, 765.
Kingston Estate, Cork—Sale to Tenants, Terms of—Instituting Inquiries, *May 11*, 1023-1024.
Mount Shannon Estate, Purchase of, to Enlarge adjoining Holdings, *May 9*, 748.
National Bank — Receivable Order under the Act of 1903—Form proposed, *May 11*, 1011.
Rockfield Estate, County Kerry, Sale of—Forcing Terms on Tenants, etc., *May 5*, 543.
Rowe Estate, Sale of—Delay in Land Judge's Court, etc., *May 2*, 122; *May 4*, 391.
Stewart Estate, County Tyrone—Sale to tenants—Progress made, *May 5*, 530.
Tredennick Estate, expediting sale of, *May 16*, 1390.
Trinity College Lands—Commission of Inquiry into Sale—Terms of Reference, *May 4*, 390.
Untenanted Lands, Division of by Commissioners — Treatment of Herds, *May 9*, 766.
Weir Estate, Sligo, Administration of, Sale of Knocalassa Grazing Farm, *May 9*, 767.
Law and Justice, administration of, *May 4*, 480.

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. G.—*cont.*
Lisburn Hurling Matches, Disturbances with regard to, Steps to be taken, *May 9*, 769, 770.
Local Government Board.
Landlords of Small Holdings—Liability for Rates — Proposed Amendment of the Act, *May 12*, 1162.
Report, Annual—Date of Tabling, etc., *May 12*, 1180.
Local Government (Ireland) Act—Order, Date of issue, *May 2*, 120.
Mallow Recreation Ground—Reason for refusing Provisional Order to acquire Land, *May 12*, 1179.
Motor Car Services, Date of Starting, *May 3*, 254.
Mount Shannon Estate, Purchase of, to enlarge adjoining Holdings, *May 9*, 748.
National Bank—Receivable Order under Land Purchase Act, 1903—Form proposed, *May 11*, 1011.
National School Teachers.
Assistant Teachers—Reduction of the Average from Sixty to Fifty—Date of Coming into Effect, *May 11*, 1022.
Salaries—Withholding Part, on account of Epidemic—Co. Neath School—Reconsidering Decision, *May 9*, 773.
School Attendance Committees, Reasons for debarring Teachers from acting as Secretaries to, *May 16*, 1372.
Neagh, Lough, Drainage of—Publication of Engineer's Report, etc., *May 16*, 1387.
Pallaskenry, alleged offensive Notice exhibited in—steps to prevent exhibition, *May 9*, 770; *May 11*, 1026.
Piers and Harbours.
Courtown Harbour, Dredging entrance to, *May 9*, 763.
Dingle Union, Need for larger Piers in—Sending Inspector to report, *May 11*, 1023.
Dredgers, provision of, from Development Grant, *May 12*, 1174, 1175.
Falchorrib and Gortnasate Piers—Dates of commencing Works, *May 3*, 253-254.
Fishing Piers, South-East Coast, Improvement of, *May 4*, 390.
Poor Law.
Deportation of F. Milner from Derby to Mountmellick Union, *May 10*, 897; *May 12*, 1178.
Medical Officers, Commission to investigate Grievances of, *Apr. 29*, 12-13.
Vagrancy, Inquiry into—Commission on Poor Laws, Terms of reference of, *May 10*, 896.

[*cont.*

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. G.—*cont.*
Powerscourt Estate—Fair Rent Appeals, Date of completing hearings, *May 12*, 1152.
Prisons—Cork Infirmary—Death of M. Curtin—Coroner's Jury's Verdict—Inquiring into conduct of Resident Magistrate, etc., *May 11*, 1025-1026; *May 16*, 1392.
Railways.
Rates and Transit Facilities for Agricultural Produce.
Butter—Rates to English Markets *May 9*, 765.
Departmental Committee of Inquiry, Appointment of, etc., *May 11*, 1027.
Tralee and Dingle, Development Fund, Grant for, etc., *May 12*, 1173–1175.
Rockfield Estate, Co. Kerry, Sale of—Forcing Terms on Tenants, etc., *May 5*, 543.
Roscommon Quarter Sessions—Notifying Jurors in the Absence of Criminal Business, *May 3*, 252.
Rowe Estate, Sale of—Delay in Land Judge's Court, etc., *May 2*, 122; *May 4*, 391.
Stewart Estate, Co. Tyrone — Sale to Tenants—Progress made, *May 5*, 530.
Tarbet and Kilrush Tourists Steamers—Government Subsidy, *May 3*, 254-255.
Thurles—Poor Law Outdoor Relief, Refusal of by Local Government Board, Alleged, *May 2*, 123.
Tipperary—Enforcing Local Government Surcharges, *May 5*, 540-541.
Tredennick Estate, Expediting Sale of, *May 16*, 1390.
Tuam—District Nurse O'Connor, Augmenting Salary of, *May 4*, 389.
Turf Thefts from Kellysgrove Bog—Advising Remission of Excessive Sentence Imposed at Ballinasloe Petty Sessions, *May 12*, 1177.
Vagrancy, Inquiry into—Commission on Poor Laws, Terms of Reference of, *May 10*, 896.
Waterford.
Bridge, New, at, Government Grants towards, *May 13*, 1297.
Evicted Tenants in—Applications for Reinstatement—Granting Return, *May 5*, 531.
Weir Estate, Sligo, Administration of—Sale of Knocalassa Grazing Farm, *May 9*, 767.
Westmeath Quarter Sessions—Notifying Jurors in the Absence of Criminal Business, *May 5*, 543.
Whisky, Foreign Spirit sold as Irish—Communication from Co. Wexford Agricultural Society, *May 5*, 531.

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. G.—*cont.*
Workhouses.
Granard — Dismissal of Master — Reasons, etc., *May 16*, 1385-1386.
Hospitals of — Obligation to admit Military Patients, *May 3*, 257.

Wyndham-Quin, Maj. W. H. [Glamorgan, shire, S.]
Yeomanry, Drill—Current Instructions—Issuing Revised Drill Book, *May 2*, 102.

Yeomanry
Army Manœuvres, Employment of Essex Regiment in—Question of Pay.
Q. Sir C. Rasch; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *May 3*, 244.
Drill—Current Instructions—Issuing Revised Drill Book.
Q. Col. Wyndham-Quin; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *May 2*, 102.

Yeomanry, Imperial
South African War, number of Volunteers and Yeomanry on active service in I. Y. during.
Q. Mr. S. Ormsby-Gore; *A.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *May 2*, 105.

Yerburgh, Mr R. A. [Chester]
Milwr and District Mines Drainage Bill, 2R., *May 9*, 837.
Instruction to Committee, *May 12*, 1242.
Navy.
"Centurion," H.M.S., condition of Gun Sights of, *May 2*, 95–97.
Battleships, Life Limits of, *May 16*, 1376.
Shipbuilding.
Battleships built in 1900 and 1904 by Great Britain, and France, and Germany combined, *May 16*, 1376.
Number of Vessels in course of construction in England and Germany, 1894, and 1904, *May 16*, 1370.
Pekin Syndicate Railways—Negotiations with the Chinese Government, *May 12*, 1157.

Yorktown and Blackwater Gas Bill
c. Rep.* *May 12*, 1146.

Young, Mr. S. [Cavan, E.]
Licensing Bill, 2R., *May 10*, 961.
Off-Licence Holders, inclusion of, in Provisions of Bill, *May 3*, 251.
National School Teachers — Salaries, withholding Part, on account of Epidemic—Co. Meath School—Reconsidering Decision, *May 9*, 773.
Whisky, Tax on—Protest against continuance of, *May 3*, 343.